

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

DR. PERCY GARDNER is Fellow of Lincoln College and Professor of Classical Archæology in the University of Oxford. The special department in which he is an authority is the religion of Greece. But he has studied the origins of Christianity. He has an acquaintance with theology, both historical and dogmatic, which would do credit to a professional theologian. He can write literary English. And he is a man of a most attractive spirit.

Professor GARDNER has just published an address on Christian Faith. It is evidence of his interest in religion that he should have chosen Faith as the subject of his address when invited to speak to the Martineau Society in 1909. It is evidence of his interest in the Christian religion that he should have called his address 'The Essential Nature of Christian Faith.' And it is evidence, further, of his sense of having something to say about Christian Faith that he publishes that address in a volume which, from the title of the first address in it, he has called *Modernity and the Churches* (Williams & Norgate; 5s.).

He divides his address on Christian Faith into three 'heads,' as though he were a preacher of the last generation. But he is not a preacher. With all his interest in theology, he is careful to observe the distance that separates the man to whom theology is the business of life, from the man to whom it is a

pastime. Nor is he of the last generation. In the first address here he speaks about those who are called 'modernists,' but there is not one of the modernists who is more modern than himself.

He divides his address into three 'heads' because he finds it convenient to speak of Faith, Religious Faith, and Christian Faith separately. And to make the comparison with the preacher complete he clears the way to his 'heads' by an introduction. Faith, he says in the introduction, is not merely an intellectual thing, such as the assent to a proposition or a creed. Nor is it merely an emotional thing, such as loyalty to a recognized spiritual authority, 'the view current in the Broad Church.' Thus he clears the way.

Then to the first head. But stay. Is the way quite clear? Are we sure that faith is not 'assent to a proposition or a creed'? Are we sure that it is not 'loyalty of heart to a recognized spiritual authority'? Perhaps the caution is enough. Let us pass on.

The first head is the nature of faith in general. And on faith in general Professor GARDNER says excellent things. It is not of the will only, he says, because the will has to do with action. It is of the spirit. For faith, though it is always an active quality, does not always produce action. Some-

times it becomes enthusiasm, 'an enthusiasm of the spirit.' That is the first thing. The second thing is its relation to experience. It rises out of experience; it goes beyond experience; it is subject to the control of experience.

But these are abstract statements, and, as Professor GARDNER says, it is not easy to convert abstract statements into the current coin of thought. So he gives examples. 'A child may know by experience that he can float in water, yet it requires a perceptible exercise of faith before he can throw himself into the water in the certain hope of rising to the top.' And he has a better example than that.

He has the example of trust. But is not trust faith? No, trust is not faith; it is the result of faith. Faith, says Professor GARDNER, is in its essence 'a self-determination, a putting of the whole being into an attitude of trust.' Faith puts the whole being into the attitude, trust is the result of that self-determination. The determination may be sudden, and the result immediate; or it may be slow, and the trust long in coming. A man determines to trust another man. The determination may be based on slowly gathered experience of the man's character. Or it may be due to an emotional impulse, to a sudden desire to love him, a sudden discovery, perhaps, that he must return the trust which the other man already has in him. And the trust that is emotional is better than the trust that is intellectual. 'Trust which, if it arose entirely out of stress of will, would be hard and cold, is the easiest and simplest thing possible when aroused by love.'

All this, we say, is excellent, and excellently expressed. We need not linger over it. The second head is Religious Faith.

Now the difference between Faith and Religious Faith is this. Religious Faith 'goes further into the realm of good and evil.' It goes as far as God. It is true, Dr. GARDNER does not use that

word. He prefers to use the word Power. But as he uses Power with a capital, there seems to be little difference. Religious Faith then, in its essence, is the belief, a belief sustained by a continuous will to believe, that a beneficent and wise Power lies behind the visible world; that the working of the universe, if it could be understood, would be found to be essentially kind and good to man; that life is worth living; and that it is, in the long run, wise to do what it is our duty to do.

But is not that simply optimism? No, watch the phrase 'in the long run.' It seems parenthetical. It is essential. The mere optimist can say that on the whole Providence is good, and life is worth living. But suppose that a man lost his belief in Providence. Suppose that an experience came to him which seemed to say that Providence was either not good or not able to make His goodness appear. Then religious faith enables him to recover his belief. And if he dies before he recovers it, religious faith enables others to believe that he will recover it in a life to come.

We reach the third head. The third head is Christian Faith. And if the title is accurate, Christian Faith is the subject of the address. What, then, is Christian Faith?

Some of us in our simplicity would say that Christian Faith is faith in Christ. Professor GARDNER does not say so. When he spoke of Religious Faith he did not call it faith in God. When he speaks of Christian Faith he does not call it faith in Christ. He calls it faith in the history contained in the Gospels, faith in the Christian spirit, and faith in the Church.

He calls it faith in the history which the Gospels contain. There may not be much history. Criticism may have carried most of it away. But 'it is of the very nature of vigorous faith that it can build securely on a very narrow platform of historic fact.' It may be necessary that we should

be able to believe in 'the life of the Founder as one really lived on earth,' and that His character and teaching are 'in essentials' to be ascertained. But that is enough.

He calls it faith in the Christian spirit. If we are to have Christian Faith, he says, we must not only believe in at least some of the things recorded in the Gospels, but we must also believe that 'after the death of the Founder a fresh spirit entered into the world, a fresh power urging to righteousness and the spiritual life.' Where did that spirit come from? Professor GARDNER does not say. Did it come from Christ? He does not say, and he does not think it necessary to say. 'That there is some relation between the spirit of Christianity and the person of the Founder may be regarded as certain.' But what that relation was, and how the new spirit arose, does not matter. It arose; it is there; and we must believe in it.

But Christian Faith is also faith in the Church. Does Professor GARDNER believe, then, that the Church is infallible? By no means. Christian Faith 'does not oblige us to believe in the infallibility of the Church, or to hold that the path taken by the Church is always the best path.' It is Christian faith if a man believes in Christ's 'general guidance' of the Church.

The Rev. HOLDEN E. SAMPSON of Broad Town Vicarage, Swindon, has written a book on 'The Catholic Church, its Functions and Offices in the World, reviewed in the Light of the Ancient Mysteries and Modern Science.' He gives it the title of *Progressive Redemption* (Rebman; 12s. 6d. net). In a short preface he tells us how he came to write the book.

He found an irresistible force within him urging him to the severe task and labour of satisfying his own mental and spiritual demands for Truth. He calls his life a weary pilgrimage. He had to follow unknown paths. He met endless disillusionments

and disappointments. He passed many years of a tempestuous lifetime, often dropping back into the currents of the world, and as often turning again to meet the opposing stream for another effort. His conduct, he thinks, might well have wearied and worn out the patience of his friends. The blind pursuit of an ever elusive light, which twinkled in the distance, but was apparently unreachably, was as much a mystery of destiny to himself as a perplexity to his neighbour. But a fate which he was powerless to control kept him doggedly on the path; till, finally, he reached the goal, and entered into the light. Then he wrote a book in two immense volumes, which he called *Progressive Creation*; and followed it up immediately with this book in one immense volume, which he calls *Progressive Redemption*.

It is a book about Mysteries and Initiation into them, about Transmutation, Equilibration, and Purification of the Natures. And there never was a book that a sympathetic reviewer found more difficulty in describing. As a poem is either a poem and very much indeed, or not a poem and nothing, so Mr. Sampson's book is either a work of the spiritual imagination and of priceless worth, or it is, as the speech of Gratiano, 'an infinite deal of nothing.'

The idea of Redemption is familiar. But what is Progressive Redemption? We have entered but a few pages into the book when we come upon the definition of a Redeemed man—a Redeemed man according to the doctrine of progressive redemption. A Redeemed man, 'if he is qualified to enter the Kingdom of Heaven free of Purgatorial suffering,' must have three qualifications. First, he must be 'a normal microcosm.' And being a normal microcosm means being 'perfect in his Nature-conditions, none of his natures or parts sundered in the incarnate life.' Next, he must have conformed faithfully to the principles of the Cross and the Serpents, embodying the Sacred Mysteries, and the Degrees of Initiation, as set forth in later

chapters of this book. He must, therefore, be finally, 'a man Pure and Uncorrupt, his Body transmuted, and in perfect *coalescence* with his Soul and Spirit,—or, in a state of *equilibrium*.'

We have quoted the definition word for word, including the italics and the capitals. Before we have had time to think out the meaning of it, we come upon the actual example of a Redeemed man. To our surprise it is the Penitent Thief.

Now the Penitent Thief of Progressive Redemption is not the Penitent Thief of popular exposition. 'The mind of the reader,' says Mr. Sampson, 'needs to be disabused of the current notions regarding the character of this person, with which common tradition has misrepresented him. He must have been far from the gallows-bird and dangerous criminal that the Christian preacher generally represents him to have been.'

Mr. Sampson does not deny that he was officially a malefactor, that is to say, that he had committed a capital offence against the Roman Empire. Very likely he was one of the Jewish Zealots, men fired with enthusiasm for their national faith and traditions, and fiercely resenting the pusillanimous and cringing subjection of the Jewish Hierarchy to the lordship of the Romans. The Roman tribunal, steadfastly set upon crushing every symptom of insurrectionary activity, made short work of suspected persons captured by the Roman soldiery and brought before them. They might be guilty, or they might not. The evidence was not carefully sifted, and the cross was close at hand.

But the Penitent Thief was not only a probable Zealot, he was probably a disciple of our Lord. Mr. Sampson's words are: 'There is little doubt that this "malefactor" was one of the secret followers of Christ, an Initiate of the Mysteries.' Christ Himself was 'a Master of the Essene Order of the Cross and Serpent.' From the language used by the thief on the cross, and

from the reply of Jesus, Mr. Sampson comes to the conclusion that the malefactor was a secret member of the same Order of the Cross and Serpent. 'Remember me,' he said, 'when thou comest into thy kingdom,' and Jesus replied, 'To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.' Both sentences, says Mr. Sampson, betray an intimate acquaintance with the sacred formulas of the Mysteries. 'Thy kingdom' and 'with me in Paradise' were talismanic formulas technically appertaining to the secret doctrine of the Mysteries. They were Signs of a Sacramental nature which linked the Master and the Disciple in the bond of secret communion. The thief on the cross is no example of a sudden 'death-bed' repentance and the conversion from a wicked life and nature; it is the case of a 'faithful Brother and Initiate receiving from the lips of the dying Master that assurance which, in the hour of his darkness, he so greatly needed, that his Eternal Destiny was sure, that death to him was the immediate passage to Eternal Life, that his course was finished, his race run, his crown won.'

In a recent number of the *Harvard Theological Review* (which has not fallen away from the very high ideal set in the early issues) there is an article on the Religious Philosophy of Rudolph EUCKEN. We shall soon be unable to name a theological review or magazine that does *not* contain an article on EUCKEN. This article is notable because the author is in entire sympathy with EUCKEN's philosophy. It is also enticing because it is wholly occupied with the essential things in that philosophy. The author is Professor Howard N. BROWN of Boston.

To enter into the article at once, Professor BROWN finds the value of EUCKEN's philosophy to consist in this. EUCKEN maintains a balance between the three supreme realities with which religion has to deal—God, nature, and the human soul. He finds that wherever in all its history religion has failed to maintain itself or to produce

good fruit, the failure has been due to the neglect of one of these three realities. Either God has not been given His due place, as in Buddhism; or man has been belittled, as in Monasticism; or nature has been denied, as in Christian Science.

In Buddhism God was neglected. For in its origin Buddhism was practically an atheistic faith. Its founder taught men to expect no help whatever from God, but to rely solely on the power for self-denial residing in their own will. Human nature, it is true, revenged itself upon this Eastern prince, and made Gautama himself its deity. But it remains until now a religion without a real doctrine of God; and in consequence it has never built up, in the minds of those over whom it has held sway, any robust spiritual life.

Monasticism belittled man. And not only Monasticism. 'For man as man,' says Professor BROWN, 'most Christians have manifested, and do still manifest, the utmost contempt.'

And here already almost every reader of EUCKEN will be arrested—every theological and almost every philosophical reader. For the philosopher, if he is a 'naturalist,' denies that man is more than the evanescent shadow of the real outward world. If he is an 'intellectualist' he holds that the outward world and all that man hopes from it is a delusion, being nothing more than a reflexion of his own inner world of thought. And whatever he is, he rejects the doctrine of human personality as that fact of 'cosmic significance,' which EUCKEN (in the words of his American interpreter) claims for it. While the theologian, unless he belongs to the newest and least theological school, will be greatly astonished at this attempt to give man a place of importance in the sight of God against whom he has so grievously sinned and come short.

EUCKEN will meet the theologian and satisfy him. From the philosopher, however, he will demand that personality be restored to man, so

that every man may be able to think of himself as a real entity, and not in any sense a succession of states of consciousness. Meantime observe that this is the first fine feature which Professor BROWN recognizes in EUCKEN's philosophy. It restores to their proper place in religion the three essential facts of God, man, and nature.

The second feature to which Professor BROWN draws attention is the relation in which EUCKEN conceives that these three stand to one another. This is the relation. God is to man friendly, and only friendly, while nature is largely antagonistic.

That God is only friendly, Professor BROWN accepts 'as a matter of course.' And we may let it pass. That nature is largely antagonistic he takes some trouble to prove. But as the proof proceeds it is impossible to avoid the suspicion that the antagonism of nature is emphasized because it is an essential part of the philosophical system. For it is the antagonism of nature that makes God necessary to man. Religion 'has always been concerned, mainly, with the means for procuring spiritual help amid the trials and hardships that men must bear. If there are no such trials and hardships, if the seeming opposition of nature to man's desires is merely a disguised friendliness, then this quest for divine help is practically useless.' So says Professor EUCKEN in the language of Professor BROWN. And it has an uneasy appearance of reasoning in a circle. But so far it does not seriously matter. There is tribulation enough in life to make us all desire a way out; there are few indeed who do not hear with relief the Divine offer, 'Come unto me all ye that are heavy laden.'

But as we proceed there emerges a more serious difficulty. 'Are God and nature then at strife?' asks the poet. And the philosopher replies with a most emphatic *Yea*. Whatever man tries to do, says EUCKEN, nature tries to prevent his doing; whatever he does she sets herself to undo. 'It is much to be doubted whether nature ever really

"adopts" any work of human hands. Wherever man has toiled to make visible his thought in wood or stone, nature following after him has done her best to obliterate his monuments. It takes her a long time to effect this in some instances, but she never surrenders the task.'

But again, it does not seem to matter. In a little we shall hear Professor BROWN admitting that nature is not actively antagonistic, that 'for the most part' she is simply indifferent. And all it seems to come to at last is the declaration that, whatever we may say about the flesh and the devil, there is an enemy whom we have to overcome called the world. And to that we all agree.

The third feature of EUCKEN'S philosophy is its insistence on the New Birth. There is the 'mere man,' or 'the petty human,' the man of flesh and

sense, man 'born of a woman' in the phrase of the Bible; and there is the 'new man,' the 'spiritual man,' the man who has been born again. For EUCKEN is most emphatic that 'in spiritual life we have to do, not with a mere addition to a life already existent, but with an essentially new life.'

Professor BROWN does not claim for EUCKEN that he has discovered and can tell us precisely where the spiritual man comes from. The wind still bloweth where it listeth. But he does claim that EUCKEN has introduced him to 'high circles of academic thought.' In other words, he has got the fact of the New Birth accepted by philosophy. And the distinction between the old man and the new is the very distinction with which we have been elsewhere made familiar. The old man thinks chiefly of his own things; the new man chiefly of the things of others.

The Authorities for the Institution of the Eucharist.

BY PROFESSOR SIR W. M. RAMSAY, D.D. LL.D. D.C.L., ABERDEEN.

PART I.

THE following paper was planned, and in great part written, early in A.D. 1901. Publication was delayed, because I had found myself driven to take Lk 22^{15, 16} in a sense diametrically opposite to the accepted view; and I shrank from once again challenging the general opinion. It seemed better, therefore, to wait and see if the interpretation which I put on those verses would stand the test of time. Now, since Professor Burkitt, Mr. Brooke, and Mr. Box have all independently declared themselves against the generally accepted view, I am able to follow with more confidence in their wake,¹ even though I may perhaps proceed to draw inferences which none of them would accept or approve.

The article was originally intended as one of a

¹ Mr. Box in *Critical Review*, January 1903, pp. 32-38; Professor Burkitt and Mr. Brooke in *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1908, pp. 569-572: I learn about the first from *Journal of Theological Studies*, Oct. 1908, p. 106.

series of comments on 1 Corinthians; but it took a wider scope. The series was published in the *Expositor*, 1900 and 1901, and came to an abrupt conclusion: in the *Expositor*, December 1901, p. 401, the writer mentions the reason: 'The succeeding paper of the series, written eight months ago, he desires to think over for another year before printing.' The single year has grown to nine; but the views expressed have not changed, though the paper is enlarged.

Having thus followed the rule of Horace, and reconsidered until the nine years have fully elapsed, I venture to print the speculative explanation of one of the most serious and enigmatic difficulties in the New Testament, the divergence between John and the Synoptists with regard to the day when the Last Supper took place. In the paper that follows the facts are arranged in a certain succession, corresponding generally to the order of historical development, which is not that of simple time;

and for the sake of clearness the theory of explanation is stated in a rather too dogmatic fashion, but it is only the desire of brevity that gives the appearance of dogmatism. What is stated is a theory about a great and confessed difficulty; and is not put forward as assured truth.

I. The chief difficulties in the accounts of the Last Supper are:—

1. The Supper occurred on the evening of Thursday (as we think, March 18th, 29 A.D.), and the Crucifixion in the afternoon of the following day, Friday. St. John (with whom evidently St. Paul agreed, 1 Co 5^{7f.}) declares that the Friday was the day when the Passover was slain, and eaten at sunset; but the Synoptists affirm that the Supper on Thursday night was the regular Passover Feast. John and Paul regard Jesus as the Paschal Lamb, slain on the Friday afternoon: the Synoptists consider that the Paschal Lamb was slain on the Thursday to make ready the Supper of which Jesus and the Twelve partook. According to John the Friday of the Crucifixion was 14 Nisan, according to Mark it was 15 Nisan.

That John was right and the Synoptists wrong in this, seems to be proved even by the Synoptic narrative: so much is now generally admitted. It is inconceivable that the Jews should have permitted the Trial of Jesus and the Crucifixion of Him and of the two criminals to take place after the Passover had been eaten and the Feast had begun. It was the Jews, and not the Romans, who caused the arrest and all its consequences; and John is beyond all question right, even according to the Synoptic testimony, in asserting that the death of Jesus and the two robbers was hurried on in order that the corpses might be disposed of before the Saturday began, *i.e.* before sunset on the Friday, lest the great day should be profaned.

How could the error of the Synoptists, *i.e.* the error of Mark,¹ have been caused? This is an unsolved problem. Professor B. W. Bacon has advanced a theory, which has one element of right in it; he recognizes that the error must have been produced by some wider cause, and that it could

not be a mere slip regarding the single detail; but beyond this his theory is unacceptable, for it does not even explain the error; there seems to be no connexion between his cause and the effect.

2. St. John describes the Last Supper without mentioning the incident of the Bread and Wine: he places similar teaching as to the partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ at a much earlier stage in the Saviour's career (6^{31ff.}). St. Paul and the Synoptists describe the incident of the Bread and Wine as occurring at the Last Supper, and as being the origin of the Eucharistic ceremony in the observance of the Church. St. John seems to imply that the Saviour's teaching at an earlier time was a sufficient cause and origin of the ceremony.

This omission in the Fourth Gospel is remarkable and beyond all question intentional. Our theory is that the error of the Synoptists and the omission by John are connected. John said nothing about the rite of the Bread and Wine at the Last Supper, because an erroneous interpretation of the meaning and importance of that incident had gained currency, and had led to the error made by Mark, and reproduced after him by Matthew and Luke.

There are other differences between the leading accounts of the incident; but they are all slight and purely verbal. The most important are the following:—

3. Paul and Luke describe Jesus as explicitly ordering the repetition of the ceremony: 'This do in remembrance of me.' Justin Martyr also mentions these words, and they were taken into the *Diatessaron* of Tatian. Matthew and Mark do not report that Christ ordered the ceremony to be repeated.

4. It is sometimes said that Luke places the Cup before the Bread: this, however, depends on a false theory of his text, as we shall see. All authorities, except the *Didache*, are agreed that the order was first the Bread, then the Wine²; and there can be no doubt that this order was observed always in the Church ritual. Hence the whole rite is regularly called 'the Breaking of the Bread,' according to the action which came first.

5. The variation between the different accounts of the words spoken by Jesus in dividing the Bread and Wine is puzzling, and deserves to be carefully studied.

¹ It may now safely be assumed that the common tradition of the first three Gospels is simply the narrative of Mark, followed by the other two. In the original form of this paper it did not appear safe to assume this without giving reasons. That it can now be taken as generally admitted is a proof of the progress that New Testament study has made.

² It has sometimes been thought that Paul puts the Cup first, in 1 Co 10^{16, 21}. This is a mistake, as we shall see.

II. The leading authorities are :—

1. The actual rite as performed in the early Church.

2. Mk 14²²⁻²⁵, repeated by Mt 26²⁶⁻²⁹ with extremely little change.

3. Lk (1) 22^{17, 18}.

4. Lk (2) 22^{19, 20}.

5. Paul in 1 Co 11²³⁻²⁶.

6. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 65.

7. Tatian in the *Diatessaron* is a secondary authority, not a primary one; but his choice was guided by a knowledge of the first authority, which was important in the estimation of all the others. The *Didache* gives rather a comment on, than an account of, the rite.

Disregarding minor variations, we may divide the words spoken into the following parts :—

A. The Consecration : i. 'This is my body,' etc.; ii. 'This is my blood,' etc.

B. The Invitation : i. 'Take, eat'; ii. 'Drink,' etc.

C. The Institution : i. and ii. 'This do in remembrance of me.'

D. The Prophecy : i. 'I will not eat,' etc.; ii. 'I will no more drink,' etc.

The following table shows how many of these parts are mentioned in each of the written accounts, and also gives the order of the parts.

	i. The Bread.	ii. The Cup.
Matthew . . .	B A	B A D
Mark . . .	B A	A D
Luke (1) . . .	D	B D
Luke (2) . . .	A C	A
Paul . . .	A C	A C
Justin . . .	C A	A
Tatian . . .	D B A	B A D C ¹

In these accounts we observe several striking features.

(1) There is a strong tendency to abbreviate. Even the longest account is, indubitably, far shorter than the actual incident. The desire of the earlier writers was to take only the rigorously necessary words, to concentrate attention on them, and to leave out everything that could be regarded as of secondary importance, or as involved or implied in what was selected for record. In some cases a writer even abbreviates his written author-

¹ C is evidently intended by Tatian as a sequel to both, being taken either from Luke (who gives it only in i.) or from Paul, who gives it in both i. and ii.

ity. Many illustrative examples might be given of the way in which the writers of the New Testament shortened their narrative, omitting words and incidents about which they knew perfectly well, if they thought that these either were not indispensable, or were sufficiently suggested in the context, or were familiar to the readers who were addressed, and might therefore be assumed.

(2) It is therefore supremely unmethodical to argue that because certain words or details are omitted in any Source, therefore the original authority from whom that Source was derived was ignorant of them. In the case of such omissions the proper question to ask first is whether there is any obvious reason why it might seem unnecessary to lengthen the narrative by including them. A good example of this is the following paragraph (3) :—

(3) There is a marked tendency in the writers to omit either B, the Invitation, or C, the Institution. Some give only B, others only C. Tatian's work is avowedly a union of everything that was found in any Gospel. Luke also has both; but, as will be shown, Luke places side by side two Sources, one of which mentions B and one C. It would be false method to infer from this that some knew only about B, others only about C, but no one knew about both. Should we not rather gather that B, the Invitation to eat and drink, was considered by some to carry with it the Institution for all time—inasmuch as the first occasion and invitation extended to all Christians and included all subsequent occasions—while others, who mentioned the words of Institution, thought that these rendered it unnecessary to quote the Invitation to do on this occasion what was being instituted as a recurring and permanent ceremony?

In short, bearing in mind that the ceremony was familiar to all readers as the chief mystery of the Church ritual, we see that some understood the command, 'Take eat,' as the first of an eternal series of repetitions, while others understood the Institution, 'This do in remembrance of me,' as implying the command to repeat the whole ceremony with the Invitation (which is tacitly assumed as indispensable).

(4) The accounts do not all come from one Source. There are at least three, perhaps even more, independent Sources. It does not, of course, follow that all those independent Sources originated in the formal narratives of persons

present at the Supper. Some of them were of that kind; but an authority of a totally different kind was used, one that had not the form of mere narrative, but consisted in the ritual reproduction of the acts and words of the Saviour as a ceremony practised in the early Church from the beginning. That the ceremony was repeated from the earliest time in the assemblies of the faithful is almost universally admitted: the theory that it was instituted by Paul has been stated, only to be rejected. This ritual repetition was familiar to all writers, and inevitably exercised much influence on their narratives.

For example, the account of the Eucharist given by Justin Martyr is said by him to be handed down by the Apostles in the Gospels. But, apparently, he quoted their accounts from memory, and his memory was much influenced by the form of words used in the Church ritual as he knew it. Again, the account given by Paul is professedly a statement of the ritual as it was regularly performed in the Church. This knowledge of the rite lay in the mind of every writer whom we possess, and was a strong force acting on them all (with the probable exception of one Source).

It will be best briefly to review the written accounts, one by one, and try to determine their origin and the degree of their dependence on the rite as celebrated in the early Church; but first a word is needed about the rite.

III. The extreme antiquity of the Church rite is almost universally admitted. It began from (or before) the time of the Last Supper. Little need be said on this point, and the little will be most appropriately stated in reference to Luke's and John's testimony.

The names that are most commonly applied to it are in themselves important as evidence. That it was called 'the Breaking of the Bread' proves that this action, as being first, was recognized as the specially characteristic fact in the rite. That it was called the Eucharist (*εὐχαριστία* in Justin, i. 66) proves that the giving of thanks was the most characteristic feature in the traditional words. All accounts agree that the acts and words were handed down from the Lord, and not changed or modified by any of the Apostles; but there is some disagreement whether Eucharistia or Eulogia was most typical among the words used by the Lord in the Breaking of the Bread.

It cannot be assumed that exactly the same

words were used in every celebration of the rite from the beginning onward. Some slight variation is always possible in the oral transmission of a ceremony in which there was a considerable amount of speaking; but there was at least one cause which militated against the admission of any change, namely, the fixed belief among the ancients that the efficacy of religious formulæ depended on the literal correctness with which the words were repeated.

None of the written accounts agrees exactly and entirely with any other in respect of the words uttered. This was not due to deficient respect for the rite or to any idea that the exact words were immaterial. It was due to the fact that none of the writers who are mentioned above aspired to become the norm or law of the ceremony. Each felt and knew that the ceremony was there independent of him and superior to his authority. Each gave an account of the rite from some special point of view: some desired to record the circumstances in which it originated, some to show that a certain character (on which they were anxious to lay stress) was dominant in it. None thought of writing a book of ritual, still less of altering the words or the character of the Eucharist. That rite was the fixed and eternal and divine fact: they were the evanescent and human recorders of circumstances connected with it.

We must therefore regard the Church rite as being, not only the oldest, but also the most authoritative record, though only an oral record, of the words and acts: it was authoritative and final for the writers whose words we read: they all presuppose and assume its existence and familiarity. This is the only true point of view for us; and thus regarded, the varying accounts present no real difficulty.

IV. Among the written accounts we shall find that it is best to begin, not with the earliest, but with the apparently simplest account of the actions of the Saviour at the most memorable point of the Supper; namely, with the account given by Mark, and repeated from him with only the slightest variation by Matthew. The details are thus stated¹:—

1. He took bread (*i.e.* a loaf, a single whole unit).²

¹ The Greek is given in p. 252, note¹.

² Paul alone makes the nature of this act quite clear.

2. He spoke a blessing, which is practically the same as He expressed thanks to God.

3. He gave to the Twelve (assuming that they then each ate a piece of the one loaf, as Paul (1 Co 10¹⁷) says).

4. He said, 'Take, this is my body.'

5. He took a cup.

6. He gave thanks.

7. He gave to the Twelve.

8. They all drank.

9. He said, 'This is my blood of the covenant poured out for you.'

10. He made a prediction as to not again drinking.

We observe that this narrative is evidently much abbreviated. There is no mention of the Breaking of the Bread, although that part of the rite was afterwards regarded as the typical one, which often gave its name to the whole ceremony; and the act of breaking or dividing the single piece among many was obviously a necessity of the situation. Mark's record leaves it doubtful whether Jesus broke the bread and handed it in pieces separately to the Twelve, or left it to the participants to break it for themselves, each taking a piece off as the single loaf was passed round the table.

Why does Mark leave this matter doubtful? It cannot be that he attached no importance to it, for other accounts and allusions show that from the beginning it was reckoned highly important. It is simply that he took much for granted as familiar to his readers. The Church ceremony was known to all. Mark assumes this knowledge: he assumes that behind his narrative is the background of Church custom, and on this background he paints with a few outlines his picture. His words implied a great deal more than their bare literal content: they were rich with the fulness of his readers' knowledge. He was not writing a history for the ignorant: he was writing a summary for the instructed (intended, perhaps, to be accompanied and supplemented by further oral instruction).

The words, 'Take, this is my body,' can hardly have been unaccompanied by further explanation. If they were not further explained by additional words, they would arouse inevitably questions and thus elicit teaching. If they were uttered alone, they could only be taken as a parable: 'Without a parable spake he not to them.' Some one of the disciples was always ready to ask some elucidation

of a dark saying.¹ The evident meaning, as Jesus held the Bread and said the words, was 'This bread represents the breaking of my body in the punishment of death on your behalf,' and the words of the Church rite (as quoted by Paul) show that the ritual repetition of the scene made this meaning explicit. Paul adds the further symbolic principle that 'We who are many are one bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread.' It seems quite possible, or even probable, that between this first action and the giving of the Cup, there elapsed a certain interval,² which was occupied with instruction in the meaning of the symbolism.

Matthew gives the opening words as 'Take, eat, this is my body.' Mark omits the word 'eat.' Luke and Paul omit both words 'Take, eat,' but add subsequent words. There is no real discrepancy here. All abbreviate, more or less; but all give enough to recall to the reader the familiar ceremony. What is omitted could readily be supplied by all whom these writers had in mind.

The choice of a different word, 'he gave thanks,' over the Cup, suggests that, while the general character and bearing of the words was the same in each case, Mark understood that there was some difference in form. The *Didache* uses the verb 'give thanks' in both cases, but makes the words, which the celebrants use in the performance of the rite, different in other respects. Paul and Luke, by the expression 'the cup in like manner,' imply that in each case Jesus 'gave thanks,' but not necessarily that the words of thanksgiving were exactly the same. We may safely infer that the words of thanks and blessing differed in the two cases.

Mark says, 'They all drank'; Matthew substitutes for this the command, 'Drink ye all of it.' This deliberate alteration of his authority was made by the composer of the First Gospel in order to bring Mark's account into closer accord with the actual words and actions of the original scene (as we shall find in studying Luke's account). Mark tended to make his narrative full of actions, with few and short speeches.

¹ There is a possibility that no one asked the meaning of the parable, because it had been fully stated by Jesus at an earlier time (as John says), and was familiar to all; and because they knew the custom as characteristic of Jesus.

² The expression of Paul and Luke, 'the cup after supper,' suggests that some interval separated the two acts.

Mark and Matthew represent the Saviour as giving a formal explanation of the purpose of the Cup, namely, that this wine is (*i.e.* symbolizes) the blood shed by Him in His death on behalf of mankind in ratification of the Covenant and Promise of God to men. Luke and Paul express the same truth in slightly different form, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood,' and Luke adds 'which is poured out on your behalf.' Probably the difference of form, 'the covenant in my blood' and 'my blood of the covenant,' arises only from variety in the Greek translation of the original Aramaic words spoken by Jesus. The addition of the word 'new' is probably explanatory. Jesus in His teaching, on other occasions and probably also then, spoke of the new Promise and Pledge which God was giving in His death. Mark and Matthew understood that the Covenant was sufficiently defined by the circumstances as 'new': Luke and Paul thought it best to state explicitly that it was new.

Matthew adds an explanatory clause 'for the remission of sins.' This is peculiar to himself, and doubtless is intended, though without written authority, to make clear the meaning which the composer of the Fourth Gospel understood to lie in the words and the situation.

Mark and Matthew add a statement as to the future, which Luke places earlier in the Supper. Our view is that Luke is more strictly correct, and that the change of order made by Mark (or by his oral authority) was due to the desire for brevity. This will become clearer in studying Luke's account.

The most important inference with regard to Mark's narrative is that it presupposes so much knowledge in the reader. Behind it lies the existing Church, with its teaching and ritual. The Eucharistic ceremony is understood to be familiar to all, and is therefore implied to be an old and established rite in the Christian society. The simplicity of his narrative is therefore only apparent. He attains much brevity and simplicity by assuming so much.

Further, he assumes the recurring ritual. He does not even mention the Institution of the Church ceremony. It did not lie in his purpose to mention what every reader knew. His intention was, in his own brief style, to record the dramatic symbolism which was embodied in the ceremony. The first performance was an acted and spoken parable (accompanied probably by

much more explanation than is recorded in any Gospel). To infer, however, from his omission of the words of Institution that he did not know about the Church ceremony, or that he thought it unimportant, is to misconceive profoundly his purpose and point of view.

Yet it is hardly possible to read Mark's account (repeated by Matthew) without inferring that he regarded the Institution of the Eucharist as a Christian accompaniment and sequel to the Passover. The meal is described by him as the Passover¹ (though nothing he tells, except the preparations (14¹²⁻¹⁶), indicates that it was that feast).² For some unknown reason, the idea had taken possession of his mind, that the Supper was the Passover, although (as has been pointed out by others) some of the things which he elsewhere records are inconsistent with this idea. What was the cause of this misapprehension? It must be associated with an idea that the Passover was in some way connected with the Eucharist, so that the latter Christianized the former. To John the slaying of the Passover was translated into Christianized form as the slaying of Christ; and the two events coincided in time. To Mark the slaying of the Passover was the preparation for the Last Supper, because the ceremony of the Bread and the Cup was an anticipation and prophecy and interpretation of the Death.

If the existing ritual was known to Mark, and assumed by him as the background of his picture and well known to all his readers, the question arises whether the rite was his authority, or whether he had some source of information independent of the Church ceremony. The answer will probably not be doubted. He possessed another authority, probably an oral authority; but in using this source, he had regard to the information with which his readers were familiar in the Church ritual. His narrative has not the appearance of being simply

¹ Spitta in his *Urchristenthum* regards this part of the Synoptic narrative as an interpolation, while he thinks that an account of the rite was originally given in the Fourth Gospel (chap. 13), but dropped out. All such theories we regard as due to thorough misconception.

² (1) ¹² 'On the first day of unleavened bread, when they were sacrificing the passover, his disciples say unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and (2) make ready, that thou mayest eat the passover? . . . (3) ¹⁴ guest chamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples? . . . (4) ¹⁶ they made ready the passover.' Similarly in Matthew and in Luke (who also depends on Mark up to this point, where the preparations are complete).

an account of the rite. His differences from the ritual are not reasonably explicable except on the supposition that he possessed another authority, to which he attached a value at least equal to that of the ritual as he knew it, so that he does not hesitate to make slight variations and to describe surrounding circumstances which throw light on the ritual. The preceding part of his narrative leads up to this incident: the sequel presupposes it: therefore the incident must be an integral part of the narrative, and cannot merely be taken from the Church ceremony.

IV. Paul mentions the Eucharistic rite twice in his first letter to the Corinthians (1 Co 10¹⁶⁻²² 11¹⁸⁻³⁴). From the first passage, which is allusive rather than descriptive, it might readily be inferred (1) that the Cup came before the Bread (as in the *Didache*, and in some manuscript forms of the Lucan account): this might very well seem to follow from the agreement of vv. 16²¹, 21¹; (2) that the word 'bless,' and not 'give thanks,' was believed by Paul to be the Saviour's words as He gave the Bread (v. 16²¹); the word 'bless' is used also by Mark (and Matthew), whereas Luke says, 'He gave thanks.'

If Paul had mentioned the Eucharist only once in this letter, these two inferences would probably have been generally accepted. Fortunately, he has also given a formal description of the rite, and we see that they are both wrong. In his experience the Bread was before the Cup, and Jesus 'gave thanks' over the Bread.² This is a typical and instructive example of the necessity of exercising the greatest care in drawing inferences from allusions. Paul had some reason in 1 Co 10¹⁶ for alluding to the Cup before the Bread. The reason apparently was that he is here contrasting two superficially analogous ceremonies, pagan and Christian, and showing their absolutely opposite nature and opposite effect; and he names the Cup before the Bread, partly because the more important part of the pagan ceremony lay in the

drinking of the wine, and partly because the common food in the pagan ceremony was not bread, but something eaten out of a dish. The emphasis laid on the breaking by the leader and the eating by all in common of one loaf was probably due to the Founder of the Christian rite, whereas the common meal of the pagan religious societies and brotherhoods probably followed the usual practice of simple Oriental meals, in which each guest has his own loaf, though all eat from a common dish.³ Paul was not thinking of the order of the Christian ceremony in 1 Co 10; he was emphasizing the contrast between it and the pagan ceremony, and mere temporal order is of no consequence. Hence also, probably, he uses the words 'the cup of blessing which we bless,' instead of 'give thanks': the former expression seemed to him to bring out into more marked prominence the distinctive feature of the Christian rite and its strongest difference from the pagan. His whole mind is occupied with the intention of emphasizing differences, not of picturing the details of the Christian ceremony exactly in their sequence.

In order to understand and to draw correct inferences from Paul (or from any other ancient writer), we must put ourselves at his point of view, and sympathize with his intention at the moment; then we shall see the subject in the same perspective in which he saw it, with the same details standing out prominently. The difference between 'bless' and 'give thanks' was to Paul a mere trifle. The two words are analogous in formation and closely akin in meaning. 'To bless' is really 'to say good words,' in Arab phrase 'to name the name of God,'⁴ i.e. to give thanks to God. It is quite probable that Paul knew that, in telling the story of that Supper, some used the word 'bless,' and some used the word 'give thanks': the difference is one merely of Greek words, the meaning is practically much the same whichever word is used.

¹ τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία ἐστὶν τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ; τὸν ἄρτον δὲ κλῶμεν οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστὶν; (1 Co 10¹⁶). οὐ δύνασθε ποτήριον Κυρίου πίνειν καὶ ποτήριον δαιμονίων· οὐ δύνασθε τραπέζης Κυρίου μετέχειν καὶ τραπέζης δαιμονίων (21). Compare Mark, καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν Λάβετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου· καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἶμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκκυνόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν (14²²⁻²⁴).

² 1 Co 11²³.

³ This was pointed out in my article on the 'Religion of Greece and Asia Minor' in Hastings' *D.B.*, v. pp. 127A, 129B, 132B.

⁴ I am quoting from a saying of Robertson Smith, who in conversation (perhaps some one will be able to quote it from one of his books), declared 'There are three rules of Mohammedan etiquette at table: (1) Name the name of God, i.e. say grace; (2) Eat only with the right hand; (3) Eat of that part of the dish that is next to you.' For the benefit of Western readers it is perhaps well to remind them that the rules apply to a meal eaten with the fingers, without knives or forks, out of a single common dish.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF REVELATION.

REVELATION XXI. I.

I.

A NEW HEAVEN AND A NEW EARTH.

'And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth are passed away.'—R. V.

1. These words open the description of the last great vision of the Apocalypse. It is a vision of the 'Bride' of Christ, and it is in two parts. First there is a vision of the New World (21¹⁻⁸), and next of the New City (21^{9-22⁵}). The New World is the place where the redeemed are to dwell. The redeemed of God are new men in Christ Jesus, and they need a new Heaven and a new Earth to dwell in.

2. 'I am very fond,' says Dr. Rendel Harris, 'of tracing out the history—what we call the evolution—of a doctrine, because doctrines do not always just drop down into the world ready-made. It means that God has been unfolding His thought to men, and they, with their lesser thoughts, have been trying to apprehend it, perhaps first from one side and then from another side, until at last they arrive at some definite and approximately final statement, and call it "a Christian doctrine."'¹ The doctrine of a new Heaven and a new Earth is found in Isaiah (65¹⁷ 66²²). It is found in the Apocrypha (Enoch 45^{4f}, 'I will transform the heaven, and make it an eternal blessing and light. And I will transform the earth and make it a blessing'). And it is found again in the New Testament (2 P 3¹³). It is the counterpart of man's personal salvation from sin, that his life shall be spent under new circumstances and in a new world.

3. Where is the New World to be found? Is it on the other side of the grave, or on this side? The question probably did not occur to St. John; it is certainly not considered by him. In our modern thinking about the future we have disarranged the centre of gravity. We draw a sharp distinction between the life that we are now living and the life after death. That distinction was quite subordinate in St. John's mind. With him the great distinction was between the life lived to

the flesh and the life lived to the Spirit. The dividing line was not physical death, but the acceptance of Christ. The new heaven and the new earth is the abode of the redeemed in Christ, whether they have passed through death or not. And there is no doubt that to the Seer's mind it is the very heaven above us and the very earth beneath us that are made new.

Let us have done with 'postponed heavens.' We want to understand how much of God is to be known in this life, and how much of the joy of God is to be known in this world. Such an understanding and such an experience is the only reasonable preparation for the life and blessedness of the world to come. I would be a Secularist on the non-Christian plan, if it were not that, happily, I am a Secularist already on the Christian plan. I understand that a great many of those people who say that this life is the right stage on which to see recovered good and banished evil are preaching the true Gospel, and that it is the Gospel of the New Testament. Now, of course, we apply this first of all to the individual, and we begin with the individual because we understand that that is God's way of dealing with the world. There is no gospel which does not proclaim the regeneration of the individual. But he tells us also that there is going to be a restored social order. It is called 'New Jerusalem.'²

4. For the word 'new' does not mean something that has not been before. It means something that has a new appearance, a new character. There are two chief Greek words translated 'new.' The one (*neos*) refers to time, 'recent'; the other (*kainos*) refers to quality, or fitness for use, 'fresh.' In Lk 5³⁸ ('new wine must be put into new wine-skins') we find both words. The wine is of recent vintage; but the wine-skins may have been made some time ago, only they have not yet been used. The new tomb in which our Lord was laid may not have been recently hewn, but it had never yet been occupied. So the new heaven and the new earth may be new in the sense of never being before in existence, but that is not what is stated; it is that they are new in character, fit for the use to which they are now to be put.

5. And so we have not to wait until the first heaven and the first earth are passed away before we find ourselves in the new heaven and the new earth. It is the coming of the new that causes the passing of the old. Although it is a trans-

¹ *Union with God*, 26.

² J. Rendel Harris, *Union with God*, 20.

formation, and possibly nearly imperceptible, the transformation does not take place by the progress of the old world in civilization, but by the introduction of a new world which causes the old to give place. The sloughing of the serpent's skin is due to the growth of the new skin beneath. Our great teacher, Robert Browning, in the poem named after Cleon, in whom he pictures the perfection of civilized man, makes him speak of this world's culture as a watch-tower, a treasure fortress, which the soul has built to overlook the flats of natural life. Yet, alas!

The soul now climbs it, just to perish there,

—to perish at the sight of a world of capability for joy, spread round it, meant for it, inviting it; and the soul craves it all; and still it may not taste of that wide enjoyment one jot more than it could when it knew so much less of it, ere it built its tower, and climbed up to look abroad. Therefore

Man sees the wider, but to sigh the more:
Most progress is most failure.¹

6. How may the new heaven and the new earth be recognized? Not so much by alteration in matter as in spirit; not so much by a change in them as in us. Life will be lived, (1) upon new conditions, (2) with a new dignity, (3) under a new character, (4) in a new liberty.

1. *New Conditions*.—A man's life is much affected by his environment, by the nature of the world he lives in. The present world may be perfect as a place for the training and discipline of life. But the discipline involves much pain and suffering. In the new world, even if the moral tests remain, there will be no more pain; sorrow and sighing shall flee away.² It will be a reformed world, a world of social reformation—work and work for all, but no drudgery. And all this will come from within, not from without.

The people who talk to us about reform do not strike down as deep into the nature of things as this. I hope I am a good reformer, in the right sense of the word. I want to see everything wrong put right—'strikes,' and all the rest of it. But the worst strike in the world is the strike against the will of God; the most terrible lock-out is when we resist blessedness and find presently that the Master of the house hath shut to the door. Our defect lies in our want of submission to God's law within.³

¹ H. S. Holland, *Christ or Ecclesiastes*, 121.

² R. Vaughan, *Stones from the Quarry*, 149.

³ J. Rendel Harris, *Union with God*, 31.

2. *New Dignity*.—Man was made for a little while lower than the angels, but God's ultimate purpose for him was that he should take princely rank. 'Henceforth,' says Jesus, 'I call you not servants, but I have called you friends.' It is a recovery of the lost fellowship which Adam had in the first Paradise. And the recovery being through the Son, it confers sonship and joint heirship with Christ. Working by way of mere civilization, we claim that 'A man's a man for a' that.' Working by way of the cross, we claim fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ.

Ever since I can recollect scientific men have been looking for what they call the missing link. What is the missing link that they look for? They say that they think there is somewhere an organism that will link you with the beast, with the newt, with the worm. Now, it is not for us to say whether they will find that link or not. They may find it. It is not the business of the Church to pronounce in such a question; it is for intellectual men to solve that according to the facts that they discover; and I neither know nor care whether they will find the link that binds us to the under world. I am not concerned about that, but why don't you lift your eyes and look at the other end of the chain and see the glorified Jesus? You cannot find the link although you are groping for it in the dirt that binds you to the world of dust and darkness, but at the other end of the chain there is a golden link that binds you to God, to immortality, to heaven, to eternity. Lift your eyes, lift your hearts. Whether you spring out of the dirt or no, you need not trouble, but here you see your kinship with God and know that you are heirs of immortality.⁴

3. *New Character*.—In the first Paradise Adam is spoken of as perfect in his innocence, the innocence of an untried child. Into the new Paradise one has entered, who has been made perfect *through suffering*. And with Him have entered those who have come out of the great tribulation and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. There is a grandeur about these men in the new Paradise that does not belong to the men in the garden of Eden. The garden of Gethsemane has done more for men than the garden of Eden did.

Some time ago there was a flower show in London, and the singularity was that all the flowers were grown in London. It is not much for you to grow flowers in the country. With your blue skies, your sweet air, your bright light, and your silver dew, it is nothing to you to rear magnificent blossoms and perfect forms of elegance and of colour. But think of growing prize lilies and roses and orchids and palms on narrow window-sills, and in dingy cellars, and in dusty attics, and amongst chimney-pots.⁵

⁴ W. L. Watkinson, in *Christian World Pulpit*, liii. 394.

⁵ *Ibid.* liii. 395.

4. *New Liberty*.—There was only partial liberty in Eden; for untried innocence must always be faced with a 'Thou shalt not.' And the trial always ends in disobedience and expulsion. Then follows the long struggle in which the seed of the serpent bruises the heel of the seed of the woman. But at last the victory is won through Christ. Into the new Paradise there enters nothing that 'maketh a lie.' And the redeemed have the right to enjoy the fruit of every tree that the garden contains.

If you are free in Christ your world shall leap to help you. And freedom comes by faith. Believe in Christ, and let Him lead you to His Father, and nothing can hold you prisoner or keep you from being all that His Father and your Father made you to be.

Ah, so may all be free!

Then shall the world grow sweet at core and sound,
And, moved in blest and ordered circuit, see

The bright millennial sun rise fair and round,
Heaven's day begin, and Christ, whose service is
Freedom all perfect, rule the world as His.¹

7. Is it only a vision? It is a vision, but 'only' is out of place. For everything that we know of God is staked upon the reality and the fulfilment of it. St. John says, 'I saw.' How did he see? First, he had his own heart's need. Next, he had the promises of Scripture that his need would be met. Then he had Christ, the historical fact and all that faith found in Him. And last of all, he had, as the gift of Christ, the spirit of revelation. All these things went together, and were bound into one grand conviction by the Seer's knowledge of the Name of God. And when he said he saw, it was no venture, but the final and full assurance.

Is it slow in coming? It may be nearer than we think.

Say not the struggle nought availeth,
The labour and the wounds are vain,
The enemy faints not, nor faileth,
And as things have been they remain.

If hopes were dupes, fears may be liars;
It may be, in yon smoke concealed,
Your comrades chase e'en now the fliers,
And, but for you, possess the field.

For while the tired waves, vainly breaking,
Seem here no painful inch to gain,
Far back, through creeks and inlets making,
Comes silent, flooding in, the main.

¹ P. Brooks, *The More Abundant Life*, 86.

And not by eastern windows only,
When daylight comes, comes in the light,
In front, the sun climbs slow, how slowly,
But westward, look, the land is bright.²

LITERATURE.

On 'New.'—Article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xii. 233, with the literature there cited.

On the *New Heaven and the New Earth*.—R. W. Church, *Pascal and Other Sermons*, 326; H. S. Holland, *Christ or Ecclesiastes*, 117; J. Rendel Harris, *Union with God*, 17; R. Vaughan, *Stones from the Quarry*, 148; C. J. Vaughan, *Temple Sermons*, 66; J. Vaughan, *The Brighton Pulpit*, No. 826; E. F. Sampson, *Christ Church Sermons*, 159; M. Nicholson, *Communion with Heaven*, 294; D. Swing, *Sermons*, 181; *Contemporary Pulpit*, 2nd ser. iii. 106 (F. Schleiermacher); *Christian World Pulpit*, xxxii. 73 (P. W. Darnton); xliii. 293 (H. S. Holland); xlv. 401 (A. H. Bradford); liii. 393 (W. L. Watkinson); lxxii. 292 (B. S. Lloyd).

II.

NO MORE SEA.

'And the sea is no more.'—R.V.

I. We love the sea. A preacher who spent his holiday in Braemar, writes enthusiastically of its frowning mountains, the silver streak of its beautiful river, the inspiration of its bracing air. But it lacked one thing. There was no glimpse to be had of the sea.³

A little girl friend of mine, whose home was by one of the great sea-lochs of the West Highlands, was being taught about heaven by her mother, and was told that there would be no sea. 'Then,' she said, 'I shall not like it.' All the child's pleasures nearly were associated with the sea—bathing, fishing, boating. On that changeful coast what is one hour mist and dulness and gloom, grey rock and wan water, is the next a fairyland of lights and colours most strange and beautiful, on which to look is enough delight. All island and peninsular nations are lovers of the sea. When Xenophon's Greeks, retreating after the battle of Cunaxa, came, after long desert marches and conflicts, in sight of the Black Sea, they burst out into joyous cries—'Thalassa! Thalassa!' A modern poet has expressed the strange fascination that the sea has for the men of these isles, in spite of all its fickleness and changes, thus:

'Ye that bore us, O restore us!
She is kinder than ye;
For the call is on our heart-strings,'
Said the men of the sea.

² Clough, *Poems* (ed. 1888), 452.

³ W. Hay, *God's Looking-Glass*, 116.

'Ye that love us, can ye move us?
She is dearer than ye;
And your sleep will be the sweeter,
Said the men of the sea.

'Oh, our fathers in the churchyard,
She is older than ye;
And our graves will be the greener,
Said the men of the sea.

In England there is too much of the blood of the old Northmen, the Sea King's followers, for men to dread the sea. It has been the means of winning empire, the path of adventure, the rough foster-mother of all manly qualities, and the defence of our freedom.¹

2. But the sea did not appeal in this way to the Israelites. They never were sailors. In the only period of their history in which they did much voyaging their ships were manned by Phœnicians—'shipmen that had knowledge of the sea.' And St. John had special reasons for disliking it. We know that he took no merely material interest in the future, and that when he says 'the sea was no more,' he was drawing no map of the geography of the new heaven and the new earth. But he had his reasons for choosing the symbol of the sea, for using it as a figure of the things which were to be absent from the world of the redeemed.

One of the things which fascinated the mind of St. John respecting the new city, was the singular *absence* of many things which characterize the cities of earth. His description of the New World is as remarkable for its omissions as for its possessions. The familiar chapter which embodies our text illustrates this truth, and shows that there is a benediction in every negation.²

3. What, then, does the sea stand for?

1. *Mystery*.—It is largely a mystery still. It is largely unfathomed and unknown. It is our great undiscovered continent.

Full many a gem of purest ray serene
The dark unfathomed caves of ocean bear.

It is itself a mystery. Says Jefferies, 'There is an infinite possibility about the sea; it may do what it is not recorded to have done. It is not to be ordered. It may overleap the bounds human observation has fixed for it. It has a potency unfathomable. There is still something in it not quite grasped and understood—something still to be discovered—a mystery.'

¹ J. T. Forbes, *God's Measure*, 77.

² See H. S. Seekings, in *Christian World Pulpit*, lxviii, 195.

This aspect of the sea impressed itself upon the Israelites. 'Thy way,' says the Psalmist, 'was in the sea, and thy paths in the great waters, and thy footsteps were not known.' And so Cowper:

God moves in a mysterious way,
His wonders to perform;
He plants His footsteps in the sea,
And rides upon the storm.

The mystery of the sea is a figure of the mystery of life. It is an aspect of life that appeals to every one. 'This world,' said Charles Dickens, 'is a world of sacred and solemn mystery; let no man despise it or take it lightly.' Christina Rossetti sings:

The mystery of Life, the mystery
Of Death I see
Darkly, as in a glass;
Their shadows pass,
And talk with me.³

Emerson tells of two members of the United States Senate who used every opportunity of leisure to discuss speculative subjects. After a time one of them retired, and the two did not meet for twenty-five years. Then one of them asked, 'Any light, Albert?' 'None,' was the reply. After a pause the other inquired, 'Any light, Lewis?' and again the answer was 'None.'⁴

The prophets have felt the mystery of life more than all others, and St. John was a prophet. Often had he prayed with Job, 'Oh that I knew where I might find him!' Then Jesus came and called him. The mystery of the past, of the present, of the future—all the mystery of life was dispelled. He knew that in the redeemed world there would be no baffling questions remaining. 'I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in the darkness, but shall have the light of life.'

Heaven overarches earth and sea,
Earth-sadness and sea-bitterness.
Heaven overarches you and me:
A little while and we shall be—
Please God—where there is no more sea
Nor barren wilderness.
Heaven overarches you and me,
And all earth's gardens and her graves.
Look up with me, until we see
The day break and the shadows flee.
What though to-night wrecks you and me
If so to-morrow saves?⁵

³ See R. J. Campbell, *City Temple Sermons*, 235.

⁴ H. S. Seekings, in *Christian World Pulpit*, lxviii, 196.

⁵ Christina G. Rossetti, *Works*, 1904, p. 286.

2. *Treachery*.—The Israelites were struck with the restlessness of the sea. But its restlessness suggested purpose. It was uncertain. It could not be counted upon. There was something akin to treachery in its moods. 'It is the scene,' says Dr. Macmillan, 'alternately of the softest dalliance, and the fiercest rage of the elements. Now it lies calm and motionless as an inland lake—without a ripple on its bosom—blue as the sapphire sky above—golden with the reflexion of sunset clouds—silvery with the pale mystic light of moon and stars; and now it tosses its wild billows mountains high, and riots in the fury of the storm.' One day it steals softly up the shore, kissing the shells and pebbles with a gentle sigh as though they were gifts of love; the next it dashes its white-crested waves, laden with wrecks and corpses, against the iron rocks. Treacherous and deceitful it lures the mariner on by its beauty, until completely in its power; and then it rises up suddenly in fury, and with an overflowing flood carries him away.¹

'You can domesticate mountains,' says Oliver Wendell Holmes, 'but the sea is *ferae naturae*. It is feline. It licks your feet—its huge flanks purr very pleasantly for you, but it will crack your bones and eat you, for all that, and wipe the crimsoned foam from its jaws as if nothing had happened.'²

St. John had had experience of the treachery of the sea in the early days of his manhood on the Sea of Galilee. And now as he looked back upon his life, what had the outward circumstances of it been but a sea of uncertainty, and even treachery? But the redeemed have sought and found a kingdom that cannot be moved. They have come to a city that hath foundations. In the New Earth the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest.

I have desired to go
Where Springs not fail,
To fields where flies no sharp and sided hail,
And a few lilies blow.

And I have asked to be
Where no storms come,
Where the green swell is in the havens dumb,
And out of the swing of the sea.³

¹ *Bible Teachings in Nature*, 303.

² *Autocrat of the Breakfast-Table*.

³ Gerard Hopkins, S.J.

3. *Separation*.—This, we may be sure, was the chief thought in the mind of St. John as he stood on some rock in the little lonely isle of Patmos and looked out across the sea. His eye was toward Jerusalem. For he was an Israelite with an Israelite's love of Mount Zion, the place where God delights to dwell.

When the Covenanters were shut up on the Bass Rock, it would not be with ideas of the freedom and beauty of the sea that their minds would be filled. They would pace the rocky height, feeling that the briny belt of water round them was their most effectual prison guard. Beyond there lay the sunny Lothians, with their rich corn lands, their breezy promontories, their wild moors; and at their feet the waves spent themselves against the cliff's foot with moans like the dirge of their captivity.⁴

St. John was an Israelite, and therefore the sea had in itself few of the attractions which it possesses for an island people like ourselves. But besides that it was the symbol of separation and exile. In Christ he had learned the meaning of the word *philadelphia*, 'brotherly love.' He loved the brethren, fulfilling the New Commandment, 'that ye should love one another as I have loved you.' And the sea now separated him from them. In the New World there will be no sea of separation. All will be one, and all will be together.

Yes, in the sea of life enisled,
With echoing straits between us thrown,
Dotting the shoreless watery wild,
We mortal millions live alone.
The islands feel the encompassing flow,
And thus their endless bounds they know.

But when the moon their hollows lights,
And they are swept by balms of spring,
And in their glens on starry nights
The nightingales divinely sing,
And lovely notes from shore to shore
Across the sounds and channels pour—

Oh, then a longing like despair
Is to their farthest caverns sent;
For surely once, they feel, we were
Parts of a single continent.
Now round us spreads the watery plain;
Oh, might our margins meet again!

Who ordered that their longing's fire
Should be, as soon as kindled, cooled?
Who renders vain their deep desire?
A God, a God their severance ruled,
And bade betwixt their shores to be
The unplumbed, salt, estranging sea.

⁴ J. T. Forbes, *God's Measure*, 78.

LITERATURE.

No more Sea.—A. Maclaren, *Sermons in Manchester*, ii. 325; H. Macmillan, *Bible Teachings in Nature*, 291; J. T. Forbes, *God's Measure*, 75; R. J. Campbell, *City Temple Sermons*, 234; T. Spurgeon, *Down to the Sea*, 45; C. H. Spurgeon, *Evening by*

Evening, 356; D. Burns, *Sayings in Symbol*, 85; W. Hay, *God's Looking-Glass*, 116; G. Matheson, *Moments on the Mount*, 32; A. Moody Stuart, *The Path of the Redeemed*, 178; C. H. Parkhurst, *The Blind Man's Creed*, 219; H. Bushnell, *Moral Uses of Dark Things*, 402; *Christian World Pulpit*, lii. 374 (Burkitt), lxviii. 195 (Seekings).

Taoism, its Christian Affinities and its Defects.

BY THE REV. P. J. MACLAGAN, M.A., D.PHIL., SWATOW.

III.

Lao-tsze's Ethical and Political Teaching.

FROM the description of Lao-tsze's Golden Age we can already see what his ethical and political teaching must be.

His ethical principle is the paradoxical 'Act non-action.' By this we are to understand abstinence from all effort of will, the abnegation of self-determination in favour of spontaneity. Action of some kind, of course, there must be. Let it be natural, the expression of your innermost being, not of your will. Let Tao, immanent in you, act through you. Lao-tsze thus calls us back to the unity of our true life from the distractions of the senses. 'The five colours make man's eyes blind: the five tones make his ears deaf: the five flavours make his mouth dull: galloping and hunting make his heart mad: goods difficult of acquisition make his conduct hurtful. Therefore the sage acts for the belly (*i.e.* for the inner man) and not for the eye (the outwardly directed senses). He puts away that and grasps this.' It must not be thought that Lao-tsze is here merely reiterating the commonplace though very necessary warning against allowing ourselves to be seduced by the variegated world of sense, or merely pointing out the baleful effects of passion on the inner life. His doctrine is more thoroughgoing than that. He would withdraw us from any deliberate following of impulse, higher as well as lower. And to enforce his lesson he appeals to what seems to him the majestic indifference of nature. 'Heaven and earth are not benevolent: they look on all things as straw-dogs. The sage is not benevolent: he looks on the people as straw-dogs.' The straw-dogs, Legge explains, were made of straw tied up

in the shape of dogs, and used in praying for rain. When the sacrifice was over they were thrown aside. 'The illustration,' Legge goes on to say, 'does not seem a happy one.' It is not so much the illustration that I would object to as the doctrine illustrated. The doctrine, however, is stated too clearly to be mistaken. Tao, blind spontaneity, gives rise to this world of things, and acts in all, and would act in us if only we did not cross and thwart it by our willings and desires, benevolent as well as malevolent.

When we find Lao-tsze adducing Heaven and Earth as the exemplars of the serene indifference he preaches, we are reminded of the lesson which M. Arnold drew from 'the intense clear star-sown vault of Heaven,' and from the sea's expanse:

And with joy the stars perform their shining
And the sea its long moon-silvered roll;
For self-poised they live, nor pine with noting
All the fever of some differing soul.
Bounded by themselves and unregardful,
In what state God's other works may be,
In their own tasks all their powers pouring,
These attain the mighty life you see.

To the poet's yearning that his soul might become 'vast' like these, there comes the answer, 'Wouldst thou be as these are? Live as they.'

Only one might claim for the Chinese thinker the superiority—perhaps the inconsistent superiority—of still having an outlook on the troubled world, in the doctrine which we shall find Lao-tsze preaching, that the 'self-poised' sage will by his influence allay 'the fever' of the distracted world.

This 'Act non-action,' then, is Lao-tsze's fundamental ethical doctrine, and it is, of course, in its

light that we must estimate the value and real meaning of Lao-tsze's several ethical precepts, his famous 'Repay injury with kindness,' his insistence on humility, the saying which has been translated, 'To the not-good I would be good in order to make them good.' Utterances such as these are said to 'secure to Lao-tsze the glory of having anticipated the lofty morality of the Sermon on the Mount.' I frankly confess that it is distasteful to me to say anything to diminish this glory. As a Christian missionary I would be glad to meet with such precepts in a non-Christian teacher. We as preachers of the Gospel have nothing to gain by lowering their moral value. If in any sense the law, even as formulated by non-Christian lips, is a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ, then the more lofty and austere it is, the greater is its preparatory use as inspiring the effort after perfection and as convicting of failure. It illustrates more clearly the fatal schism between our knowledge of what is good and our will to do it, and makes more conspicuous the incomparable excellence of Him who was, as well as taught, the Truth. And, further, the more the precepts of Christian morality can be paralleled or approached by the maxims of non-Christian teachers, the more we missionaries are taught to recognize that the peculiarity of Christianity, that, therefore, which should be prominent in our preaching, is not morality but grace, the grace of forgiveness and of God's Holy Spirit. It is not, then, a Christian bias but exegetical accuracy which leads me to question the loftiest meanings which have, as I think, been read into the precepts and virtues of Taoism. For instance, can anything have a more Christian sound than 'Recompense an injury with kindness'? But is this really what Lao-tsze said? I am afraid not. We must remember that the word here translated 'kindness' is *Teh*, which in our Classic has a special meaning. This meaning we can hardly dismiss here. I question, indeed, whether *Teh* ever means 'kindness.' It means virtue, character which embodies the moral principle, which moral principle we must therefore know before we can tell what the corresponding virtue is. Now the moral principle of Taoism is *Tao*, and *Tao* is, as we have seen, pure spontaneity. Then the corresponding virtue (*Teh*), the manifestation of *Tao*, is spontaneous action. In short, the maxim 'Recompense an injury with kindness' should rather run 'Recompense an injury by being your

true self, since your true self is *Tao*, by indifference, by going on in your own way.' This may or may not be better than revenge or even than retributive justice. It is certainly not the Christian law of kindness to enemies.

Again, there is much that is attractive in Lao-tsze's insistence on humility, and much that seems akin to our Lord's words, 'Whosoever would be great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you shall be your servant.' 'The highest excellence,' says Lao-tsze, 'is like water. The excellence of water appears in its benefiting all things, and in its occupying without striving the low place which all men dislike. Hence it is akin to *Tao*.' 'The sage, wishing to be above men, puts himself by his words below them, and wishing to be before them places his person behind them.' 'Hence the sage is able to accomplish his great achievements. It is through his not making himself great that he can accomplish them.' But here, too, we must recognize that the humility of which Lao-tsze speaks is neither the humility which is the inseparable companion of reverence for the Supreme Good, nor the spirit of self-sacrificing love for others. It is merely the passivity and plasticity which are indicated by its symbol water, indeterminateness as contrasted with the definiteness of self-determination. I do not deny, of course, that even this may have an ethical value. If we must seek a Christian analogue to it, we may find one in that unreluctant acceptance of the Divine Will revealed in Providence, which is one of the notes of saintship.

Or to take the other utterance which has been brought forward as one of Lao-tsze's glories, 'To the not-good I would be good in order to make them good'; here, too, 'good,' of course, means good in a Taoist sense. In the chapter from which this saying is quoted we have a hint of what this goodness is. 'The sage has in the world an appearance of indecision, and keeps his mind in a state of indifference to all.' In another chapter we have an equivalent of the saying we are discussing, and the vaunted 'To the not-good I would be good in order to make them good' sounds less Christian, does it not, when translated into this equivalent, which runs, 'I will do nothing and the people will be transformed of themselves'?

While thus insisting that the maxims of the *Tao Teh King* must be interpreted, if we would get at their meaning in Lao-tsze's system, by the light of

Lao-tsze's central principle, I am as ready as any one to admit that many of them are admirable in their Chinese expression and in their illustrations, and are easily receptive of a Christian meaning. Here, for instance, is an ingenious illustration of the usefulness of being nothing, which at once appeals to the homiletic instinct, 'Clay is fashioned into vessels, but it is on their empty hollowness that their use depends.' Here is a witty criticism of ambitious vanity, 'He who stands on his tip-toes does not stand steadily.' Here are fresh illustrations of the familiar *Μὴδὲν ἄγαν*. 'It is better to leave a vessel unfilled than to attempt to carry it when full. If you keep feeling a point that has been sharpened, the point cannot long preserve its sharpness. When gold and jade fill the hall, their possessor cannot keep them safe. When wealth and honours lead to arrogancy, this brings evil on itself. When the work is done and one's name is becoming distinguished, to withdraw into obscurity is the way of Heaven.'

A very few words will suffice to bring before us Lao-tsze's political theory. His aim is, of course, to bring back the golden age of instinctive morality and the simple life. In chap. 81 he tells us plainly what his ideal is. 'In a little state with a small population I would so order it that though there were individuals with the abilities of ten or a hundred men, there should be no employment for them. I would make the people, while looking on death as a grievous thing, yet not remove elsewhere to avoid it. . . . I would make the people return to the use of knotted cords (as helps to memory instead of using written characters). They should think their food sweet, their clothes beautiful, their dwellings places of rest, and their common ways sources of enjoyment. There should be a neighbouring state within sight, and the voices of the fowls and dogs should be heard all the way from it to us, but I would make the people to old age, even to death, not have any intercourse with it.' Lao-tsze diagnoses the causes of 'the present discontents.' 'The people are difficult to govern because of the activity of their superiors in governing them.' 'The difficulty in governing the people arises from their having much knowledge. He who tries to govern a state by his wisdom is a scourge to it; while he who does not try to do so is a blessing.' Lao-tsze's panacea, the application of which would make time run backwards and the Golden Age return, is easily guessed. 'In the

kingdom the multiplication of prohibitive enactments increases the poverty of the people; . . . the more display there is of legislation the more thieves and robbers there are. Therefore a sage has said, "I will do nothing, and the people will be transformed of themselves. . . . I will manifest no ambition, and the people will of themselves attain to the primitive simplicity." This same thought Lao-tsze also gives us in a metaphor more quaint perhaps than clear. 'Governing a great state is like cooking a small fish'—white-bait, for instance, which requires little handling before being committed to the pan or while in it.

Lao-tsze's politics, then, are the simple extension of his Ethics. Where we may feel some difficulty is no doubt in our inability to share his belief that if the sage, strictly exemplifying Taoist ethics, 'does nothing,' the people will transform themselves and the ideal Taoist kingdom be realized. This is to overstrain our faith in the doctrine of *laissez faire*. Indeed, even Lao-tsze seems at times to fall from the height of his theoretical belief. He seems to admit, *e.g.*, that war is sometimes unavoidable. For him, however, the transition from his ethics to his politics is made easier by the characteristically Chinese doctrine of Example, or perhaps we should rather say of Influence. It is a very real doctrine to the Chinese. Does not, or at least did not every schoolboy learn that the mother of Mencius thrice changed her abode before she could find a suitable neighbourhood for the upbringing of her son? Did not the criminal code visit with punishment not only the parricide but the parricide's neighbours, whose influence had failed to restrain him? Example is too narrow a word. The influences which proceed from man, the ideal man, the sage, extend beyond humanity, and are even cosmic in their scope, so that *Man* makes up with Heaven and Earth the Triad of the Powers. 'If a feudal prince or the king could guard and hold the Tao, all would spontaneously submit themselves to him. Heaven and Earth under its guidance unite together and send down the sweet dew.' A doctrine which seems so extravagant, and which is so persistent in Chinese thought, deserves a fuller investigation than can here be undertaken. I should like to see it related in the way of connexion and contrast with the Old Testament prophecies of the fruitfulness and felicity of the Messianic age, and with the New Testament doctrine of the Holy Spirit as

mediated by the glorified Son of Man. The Holy Spirit was not yet given—'because Jesus was not yet glorified.' The main outlines of Lao-tsze's system—so far as I have been able to sketch them—are now before us. It is not difficult to see that his teaching, metaphysical, ethical, political, is all of one piece. The dominant thought is of Pure Spontaneity, the origin of all things and agent in all operations, which should also be allowed to act in the individual and in society.

As to Lao-tsze's metaphysics, I have already said all that I intended to say in the way of criticism when I suggested the contrast between Tao and God as ultimate principle. When we pass on to criticize Lao-tsze's practical teaching, the first question that occurs to one to put is this, How is there room for any practical philosophy at all? If all is from Tao, and Tao operates in all, how can we have prohibitions and commands, and obedience and disobedience? Whence comes the power that can oppose Tao and should be subject to it? How comes it that there has been a false development away from the spontaneity of Tao into vices, or even into self-conscious virtues, so that we need to cut off our sageness, wisdom, benevolence, and righteousness to attain to our true life? These are questions to which, of course, we get no answer.

If, then, it is not so that 'whatever is, is right,' we have need of some criterion of judgment and rule of living. Lao-tsze refers us to nature, for instance, to the calm indifference of Heaven and Earth, and the quietude of vegetative growth. But then again we read: 'A violent wind does not last for the whole morning: a sudden rain does not last for the whole day. To whom is it that these things are owing? To Heaven and Earth. If Heaven and Earth cannot make such spasmodic actings last long, how much less can man?' In short, not even nature perfectly exemplifies Taoistic principles. Indeed, as Wordsworth reminds us, we may find there quite other lessons than those of quietism:

The wind, the tempest roaring high,
The tumult of a tropic sky
Might well be dangerous food
For him, a youth to whom was given
So much of earth, so much of heaven,
And such tumultuous blood.

Whatever in those climes he found
Irregular in sight or sound,
Did to his mind impart

A kindred impulse; seemed allied
To his own powers, and justified
The workings of his heart.'

Now Lao-tsze condemns a good many of the workings of our heart, and if to fortify his opinion he refer us to the impassivity of Heaven or the quiet and self-absorbed growth of a cabbage, it seems equally open to us who feel the pulse of our tumultuous blood to appeal to the wind and the tempest roaring high. I suppose that Lao-tsze would reply, 'You imitate these phases of nature at your peril.' 'If Heaven and Earth cannot make such spasmodic actings last long, how much less can man?' 'The violent and strong do not die their natural death,' he says in another place; and adds, 'I will make this the basis of my teaching.' In short, when Lao-tsze comes to the varied aspects of nature, he selects the calm persistence of Heaven, the quiet processes of the vegetable world, the humility of water, because he finds in them embodiments of the ideals he has already got elsewhere—simplicity, quietude, lastingness. One cannot but be struck with the prominence in the *Tao Teh King* of this idea of lastingness. As we saw from the very first chapter the permanent is the real; the definite and nameable is transitory. It might be thought, then, that Lao-tsze would have no difficulty in reconciling himself to the idea of transitoriness, and we might seek this reconciliation in the not very explicit hints that he gives of a cyclical process from non-existence through definite existence back to non-existence again, along with the illustration that he apparently finds of this process in the vegetative world dying down to the root, and thence again springing up. But the human heart, even of an Eastern philosopher, is not thus satisfied. Whatever he may have thought of things, Lao-tsze desired immortality for himself. He never reconciled himself to death, or at least to the thought of ceasing to be. To the common people Death is always 'the Great Fear,' even though they were brought to accept it as their inevitable fate. But is it inevitable? Lao-tsze almost seems to have thought that it is not, at least for the sage. 'Heaven is long enduring, and Earth continues long. The reason why Heaven and Earth are able to endure and continue long is because they do not live of or for themselves. This is how they are able to continue and endure. Therefore the sage puts his own person last, and yet it is found in the foremost place: he treats his

person as if it were foreign to him, and yet that person is preserved.' Lao-tsze speaks of a strange invulnerability which the sage enjoys. 'I have heard that he who is skilful in managing the life entrusted to him for a time travels on the land without having to shun rhinoceros or tiger, and enters a host without having to avoid buffcoat or sharp weapon. The rhinoceros finds no place in him into which to thrust his horn, nor the tiger a place in which to fix his claws, nor the weapon a place to admit its point. And for what reason? Because there is in him no place of death.' At one time Lao-tsze seems to be thinking of an immortality that does not evade death, but survives it. 'He who dies and yet does not perish has longevity.' But again, by what seems a regrettable declension from philosophic levels, he gives us strange directions as to the management of the breath, by which the Taoistic state may be induced, and this physical life might be fostered, if not indefinitely prolonged. 'The Tao which originated all under the sky is to be considered as the mother of them all. When the mother is found, we know what her children should be. When one knows that he is his mother's child, and proceeds to guard the mother in him, to the end of his life he will be free from all peril. Let him keep his mouth closed, and shut up the portals of his nostrils, and all his life he will be exempt from laborious exertion.' 'When the intelligent and animal souls are held together in one embrace, they can be kept from separating. When one gives undivided attention to the breath, and brings it to the utmost degree of pliancy, he can become as a babe.' To the babe-like Taoist, again, immunity is promised—'poisonous insects will not sting him,' and so on. We may have seen an infant, ignorantly fearless, allowing a bee to crawl on his arm without being stung by it, where a nervous adult would certainly have provoked retaliation. This may be an illustration of the immunity Lao-tsze means. At any rate there seems to be some management of the breath which helps to induce the Taoistic state to which some sort of immunity and immortality is promised. However unsatisfactory and vague these references to immortality are, they as well as the later Taoism, with its pills and elixir of long life, prove that in the Far East there are those who stretch out blind hands, and to whom we can bring near the boon they are groping after, exhorting

them 'to lay hold of the life eternal.' The suggestion that the promise of life, of the more abundant life which appeals to us of the strenuous West, has no attractiveness to the contemplative East, is not true of the most contemplative thinker whom China has produced.

We must remember, however, that besides last-*ingness* or immortality, simplicity and quietude are also Lao-tsze's ideals. These are good words. We have to complain, however, that they are too much emptied of positive content. The simplicity or unity which is inculcated is like Tao itself, rather the unity of undeveloped potencies than the rich harmony of developed powers. Of course the call to 'recollection,' to gather in one's powers to their centre, 'to preserve the inner being,' is always of ethical value. But in Lao-tsze this teaching becomes too negative, and tends to the impoverishment of life. One can see, perhaps, how Lao-tsze was led to his position. He had a keen sense of the opposition between man's true nature and the kind of living that he saw around him. The evil, he protests, lies in the multifarious distractions of the will and passions. What should be regulative is the true essence of man. This is to be found in the abysmal depths—hardly of personality, rather of mere being, the residuum which Lao-tsze found when in his search for the ultimate truth of things he thought away all their qualities. And yet it would be unfair to speak as if Lao-tsze had no other message than that of abscission and suppression. Over against the negative thought of retraction from the world in order to be one's true self is the positive idea of the spontaneous outgoing of this true being. But then natural spontaneity—blind instinct—is not fitted to displace rational self-determination as a moral term.

It must be reckoned to Lao-tsze's credit, however, that his philosophy is so thoroughly a moral philosophy, with an equal emphasis on both terms. He is no speculative dilettante, but an earnest thinker whose aim is the regulation of life, and who is a *thinker* because he cannot be content with a casual collection of maxims. Here he contrasts favourably with Confucius. Confucianism tends to lose itself in externalities and formalities largely because it is a thing of regulations rather than of principles. It has indeed its theories of human nature, and its morality in a way depends on its psychology, but there does not seem to be in it any inherent necessity to fall back on what

may be discoverable of the ultimate nature of things. I wonder if I am unfair to either term of the comparison if I say that Confucianism reminds me of that intuitional theory of morals, which supposed us to be furnished by the constitution of our minds with a set of disjunct maxims, equally irreproachable and inexplicable. Now the moral philosophy of Lao-tsze has a unifying principle, and is of one piece with his metaphysics. The moral conduct he would have us exemplify is the unforced spontaneous expression of our truest being. It is more. It is the expression in us of the true life of the Universe. This teaching of Lao-tsze is therefore a welcome counterpoise to the legalism and externalism of Confucius, and has affinities with Christian Ethics if we are true to the evangelical standpoint, and look on Christian morality 'as the expression of 'the life of God in the soul of man.'

I would claim for Lao-tsze's teaching a religious value also. In view of Lao-tsze's attitude to the religion of his time, and the disparity between his blind and dark Tao and any idea that we would convey by the term 'God,' it may seem too bold to seek in his thinking for any religious element. But a man's religion is just his relation to that which he believes to be the ultimate. And it does seem to me that in Lao-tsze's relation to Tao we have a remarkable approach to one phase of the Christian idea of faith. Lao-tsze insists that our true life must begin in an act of self-abnegation by which we yield ourselves to Tao to act in us and through us. He does not disguise the austerity of the call he thus addresses to us. Tao is devoid of outward attraction. Its possessor and practiser is the butt of men's scorn. 'Tao as it comes from the mouth seems insipid, and has no flavour.' Speaking of himself as a lover of Tao, Lao-tsze says: 'The multitude of men look satisfied and pleased as if enjoying a full banquet, as if gazing on a spring landscape. I alone seem listless and dull. All men have their spheres of action, while I alone seem dull and incapable, like a rude borderer. I alone am different from other men, but I value the nursing mother.' 'Scholars of the highest class when they hear about Tao earnestly carry it into practice. Scholars of the middle class, when they have heard about it, seem now to keep it, and now to lose it. Scholars of the lowest class, when they have heard about it, laugh greatly at it. If it were not laughed at, it would not be fit to be the Tao.' Tao is thus outwardly unattractive. It conceals

itself, and can be seen only by the pure in heart. 'He who has desires sees only the outer limit; he who has no desires sees the inner essence.' The initial step of the Taoist life, the withdrawal from the busy life of 'the wild will' and many desires, must be in some measure taken before Tao discloses itself, an act of faith in order that Tao may disclose itself. And what is true of the beginning is true all through. In one sentence, which I have already quoted, Faith is explicitly demanded. It is where Lao-tsze has been describing the happy results that would follow if a Ruler were to practise Tao, results which to the worldly-wise seem unlikely enough. 'If,' Lao-tsze says, 'the ruler has not sufficient faith in Tao, the people will not have faith in him.'

A venture of faith is called for. But he who ventures finds himself in contact with the very source of life, the universal 'nursing mother.' And there is the assurance that his faith will not be in vain. 'Heaven,' says Lao-tsze, 'is without partiality. It is always on the side of the good man.' I have not time to discuss Lao-tsze's consistency in making this allusion to Heaven. I suspect that in the light of his system Heaven cannot be more than a sort of personification of the course of events; Providence, as we loosely use that word, is perhaps our nearest equivalent. In any case, the saying indicates the optimism in the strength of which we are encouraged to have done with our restless strivings, 'to cast our deadly doings down,' and to trust ourselves to Tao in utter self-abnegation.

I omitted my introduction, and I shall not indulge in any lengthened peroration. 'The first English writer who endeavoured to give a distinct account of Taoism was the late Archdeacon Hardwick, while he held the office of Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge,' in his book entitled *Christ and other Masters*. Among these other masters Lao-tsze has his place. I cannot, indeed, use the words of a fellow-missionary, who speaks of 'the quiet peace which the study of Lao-tsze has brought' to himself, and calls himself Lao-tsze's 'disciple.' Such a profession of discipleship, if it is seriously meant, seems to me to be excluded by the words of our Lord: 'One is your master, even the Christ.' But I recognize in Lao-tsze a seeker after the truth, who in many ways has evinced the natural Christianity of the human soul. I salute him as one of those 'Scholars of the highest class,' who, if he had heard of the true Tao, would not have laughed at it, but would have earnestly carried it into practice.

The Centralization of Israel's Worship.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN E. M'FADYEN, M.A., TORONTO.

WHEN Israel invaded Canaan and began to settle upon the land, she found everywhere throughout it an idolatrous worship vigorously maintained by the older inhabitants upon the so-called high places (Dt 12²). These were very frequently upon hill-tops (Hos 4¹³), but the word came to be applied in a more general way to any seat of idolatrous worship; and probably every city or village had a high place of its own (2 K 17⁹), in which the Baal of the district was worshipped. In her occupation of the land, nothing was more natural than that Israel should take over some of those high places and make them centres of the worship of her own national God. Von Gall (*Altisr. Kultstätten*, 1898) has enumerated nearly a hundred such centres, many of which, such as Gilgal and Beersheba (Am 5⁵), were the objects of pilgrimage. The sites glorified in the stories of the patriarchs, and associated with those ancient names—Shechem with Abraham (Gn 12⁷), Beersheba with Isaac (26³³), Bethel with Jacob (28¹⁹)—must have been famous seats of worship long before the invasion of Canaan by Israel; and they continued to enjoy their prestige, and to be the pride and joy of the people, at least down to the time of Amos and Hosea, in the 8th century B.C.

Of the legitimacy of these places of worship in the mind of early Israel there can be no doubt. Her leading men deliberately identify themselves with the worship that was there carried on, and even take a foremost part in it. Samuel presides over a sacrifice held in a high place (1 S 9¹²); Solomon on a great occasion sacrifices at Gibeon (1 K 3⁴); Elijah defends the cause of Israel's God at the altar on Carmel (1 K 18^{21ff.}), and he complains bitterly that the altars at which Jahweh was worshipped had been thrown down throughout the land (1 K 19^{10, 14}).

Connected, however, with the worship upon the high places were very grave dangers. The worship of Jahweh there celebrated tended to degenerate into a worship scarcely distinguishable from that of Baal. The two had, indeed, from the beginning many elements in common. Jahweh could Himself be called Baal, as many Hebrew proper names show; the association of deity with springs, trees,

stones, etc., was common to both, many of Israel's shrines being admittedly connected with these things—Hebron with a tree (Gn 13¹⁸), Beersheba with a well (26³²), Bethel with a stone (28¹⁸). The sensuous rites with which the older inhabitants had celebrated the fertility of the land, could hardly help infecting the worship of Jahweh. And such we know to have been the case. Immorality was freely practised at the shrines (Am 2⁷, Hos 4¹³), and indulgence of other kinds was also rampant (Am 2⁸); and these excesses not only were not restrained, but they appear to have been abetted by the priests, who sometimes even behaved with unscrupulous violence (Hos 6⁹). The worship was frankly idolatrous (1 K 12²⁸, Hos 8⁶ 10⁵), in most respects practically a Baal-worship—a shameless caricature of true Jahweh-worship; and we cannot wonder that the earlier prophets foretell the destruction of the sanctuaries at which it was practised (Am 7⁹, Hos 10⁸).

Less grave than these moral offences, but not unimportant, was the inadequate conception of the unity of Jahweh which the multiplicity of shrines tended to encourage. He was the one God who had given Israel the land and victory; but the various shrines, with their, no doubt, partly varying types of worship, were in danger of obscuring this unity, so that the Jahweh of Gibeon, who appeared to Solomon in a dream (1 K 3⁵), might be practically conceived as a different person from the Jahweh of Hebron, to whom Absalom had vowed a vow (2 S 15⁷). The purity of Jahweh-worship as practised at the shrines was in grave danger, then, from these two sources: His unity was obscured, and—what was of more practical importance—His moral demands were ignored.

A reformation was needed; and yet, in a sense, reformation was impossible. Affection for the shrines, hoary as they were with ancient traditions, and alive with happy, joyous memories, was too deeply planted in the hearts of the people to be lightly uprooted by the reforming party, especially as the land was covered from end to end with these seats of worship, and their influence, partly for good, largely for evil, spread like a network throughout the whole life of the people; and, as under

these circumstances improvement seemed impossible, the only alternative was the abolition of these places, and the centralization of the worship in one spot, where it could be controlled by those to whom its purity was dear. The way for this centralization had already been gradually prepared. A certain pre-eminence would, no doubt, from the first attach to the sanctuary in which the ark was present—*e.g.* Shiloh (1 S 3). But, after the destruction of Shiloh (*cf.* Jer 7¹²), the claims of Jerusalem, as soon as the monarchy had securely established itself, would soon begin to overshadow those of other shrines—at least of the shrines of Judah; for, of course, northern Israel had famous shrines of her own, notably at Bethel and Dan (1 K 12²⁹). For one thing, Jerusalem was the capital, and the political centralization effected there would create an atmosphere in which the idea of religious centralization would begin to flourish. Besides, the temple was attached to the palace, and would gather to itself the glory associated with royalty. It was a sort of king's chapel, built on a scale so magnificent that it must have thrown all the other high places of Judah into the shade, and its sacrifices and ceremonies would be conducted on an equally splendid scale.

When the northern kingdom fell, in 721 B.C., and Judah became the real centre of Hebrew life, the importance of Jerusalem, in the religious as well as in the political aspect, must have been greatly enhanced; and the prestige already attaching to it must have been enormously increased when, twenty years later (701 B.C.), the city and temple were spared in Sennacherib's invasion of Judah, which destroyed forty-six other cities, and dealt, no doubt, a serious blow to the prestige of their high places. The belief in the inviolability of Jerusalem, encouraged by this deliverance, and doubtless also by the preaching of Isaiah, must have continued to be held with great tenacity, for a century later Jeremiah (26¹¹) finds it necessary to enter a very strenuous protest against it—a protest which nearly cost him his life. Thus everything conspired to point to Jerusalem as the true centre of Jahweh-worship, should the time ever come for its centralization. The need for that centralization we have already seen—a need created by the immorality of the sanctuaries generally, and by the imperilled unity of Jahweh; for Jahweh is one (Dt 6⁴), and from one God it was easy to argue to one sanctuary. In the 7th century a

reform programme was drawn up, and embodied in Deuteronomy in 621 B.C. The reformers at one stroke declared the worship of the shrines throughout the land as illegal, and centralized the worship at Jerusalem, which is described as 'the place which Jahweh your God shall choose' (Dt 12⁵). From that day on—theoretically at least—Jerusalem is the place where alone Jews ought to worship (Jn 4²⁰), and in later times we hear no more of the high places. The exile of half a century in Babylon (586–537) effectually severed the people from all such associations, and in later times it was the dearest ambition of every loyal Jew of the Dispersion to visit Jerusalem and participate in the worship of the temple (Ps 84).

Practically, however, the victory was not so complete as it seemed to be. The people can hardly have witnessed the demolition of their beloved shrines without the deepest resentment, and the death of the reforming king Josiah on the battlefield (608 B.C.) gave a great impetus to the reactionaries, so that Jeremiah's complaint—whatever be its date—that the gods of Judah are as numerous as her cities (2²⁸ 11¹³), is probably nearly as applicable to the time after as before the Deuteronomic law. Many of the survivals of idolatrous and superstitious worship attested for post-exilic times (Is 57^{3ff.} 65^{3ff.} 66¹⁷) were probably associated with the sites of ancient high places. But in spite of such sporadic usages, the exclusive legitimacy of the worship at Jerusalem was, from the time of the return, acknowledged—at least by all loyal Jews—in practice as it had already been in theory; and the spiritual needs of those who resided at a distance from Jerusalem were met by synagogues.

For the Samaritans, however, as is well known, who formed a schismatic community in the 5th or 4th century B.C., the place of worship was Gerizim (*cf.* Jn 4²⁰), and this it has continued to be to this day. More remarkable, however, is it to find, in spite of the Deuteronomic law, a temple of Jahweh in Egypt erected by Egyptian Jews. According to the Elephantine papyri published by Sachau in 1907, a temple of Jahu (Jahweh) at Jeb (Elephantine) was destroyed in 411 B.C. by order of the Persian governor Waidrang, at the instigation of the priests of the Egyptian god Khnub, and the Jews appeal for its restoration to the Persian governor of Judah and the high priest. In the course of the letter they acknowledge that the

temple is at least as old as Cambyses' invasion of Egypt (525 B.C.). Even that, however, would be a century after the publication of the Deuteronomic law, enforcing centralization. Steuernagel (*S.K.*, 1909, 7 ff.) has suggested that the Jews who built this temple had gone to Egypt as auxiliaries to aid Psammetichus I. against the Ethiopians about 650 B.C. In that case they would have been unacquainted with the Deuteronomic law, and their creation of a temple would be altogether

intelligible. It is also possible, if the colony should be proved to have been founded later—and it may even be earlier—that the views of the Egyptian Jews in this respect, as in some others, were more liberal than those of the motherland. We also know that a temple, modelled on that at Jerusalem, was erected by Onias IV. at Leontopolis in Egypt, about 160 B.C., where worship was regularly maintained till after the fall of the Jerusalem temple (Josephus, *Ant.* XIII. iii. 1).

Literature.

SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

THE conflict between Religion and Science is not yet at an end; and some think that it is never like to be. But it has undoubtedly entered upon a most interesting stage of its history. There were once dogmatists in Religion who denied the right of Science to exist. St. Paul spoke of 'science falsely so called.' They said all science was falsely so called. There are now dogmatists in Science, like Haeckel and Mr. McCabe, who deny the right of Religion. But if Religion did not accomplish the suppression of Science in its infancy, Science will not succeed in annihilating Religion in its manhood. The new phase of the conflict is the recognition of the right of Science to exist and of Religion to exist, and the inevitable inquiry thereupon whether they can occupy adjacent territory in peace or must continue to go to war for some territory lying between them to be for ever claimed by both. One thing is certain. It will be better that the conflict should continue than that Religion should be content to claim its men of religion, leaving Science to retain its men of science.

The whole subject has been considered by Professor Émile Boutroux of the University of Paris, and he has written a book upon it, which has been translated by Mr. Jonathan Nield, under the title of *Science and Religion in Contemporary Philosophy* (Duckworth; 8s. net). What conclusion does he come to? The first conclusion he comes to is that men of religion are no longer to be satisfied without science, and that men of science are no longer to be satisfied without religion. And that is not only the first thing, but

the last. For it really does not matter, then, though Science and Religion should continue to quarrel a little about their boundary-stones. If the time should come when Germany should say to France (in the language of Mr. G. K. Chesterton), 'I need also your swiftness and experimentalism'; and France should say to Germany, 'And I need something of your slowness and reverence,' it does not follow that Alsace-Lorraine will become Alsace and Lorraine, but it will be a great step towards perfection, the perfection of individual Germany, and the perfection of individual France. The absurdity called Germany shall correct the insanity called France, and both shall be vastly the better of it.

But what will Science stand for? It will stand for the study of phenomena and for the conclusions which may be drawn from that study. And what will Religion stand for? It will stand for the interpretation of science and for the unexpected that occurs in the study of phenomena. For the unexpected does occur. Science supposes—science is built upon the supposition—that all phenomena are only the repetition of a single phenomenon. And it is so, except when the unexpected happens. 'We labour for what is uncertain,' said St. Augustine; and the saying made a great impression on Pascal. It is another way of saying, 'We live by faith.'

But this faith when it is exercised finds its object more certain than are the phenomena of Science. And then it proceeds to love. Faith, representation of an ideal, enthusiasm or love—these three make up the 'insanity' called Religion, without which the 'absurdity' called Science cannot be made perfect.

WASHINGTON GLADDEN.

Dr. Washington Gladden 'would like to be guaranteed another seventy years in just such a world as this.' And yet the seventy he has had have not kept him lying on a bed of roses. His *Recollections* (Constable; 7s. 6d. net) give a lively description of the life of a congregational minister in the United States, and it is undoubtedly very much what he calls it, 'suffering and sorrow, struggle and privation, hard knocks and tough luck.'

Washington Gladden lost his father at the age of six or seven, and his mother married again. That father's influence has been with him all the years, but it could not keep him from the hard knocks. He was sent as apprentice to a local printer; sent himself to Williams College, where he heard President Mark Hopkins ask some questions out of the 'Shorter Catechism'; and then, after a very short spell of 'schoolmastering,' he was licensed to preach the gospel. 'The certificate of licensure,' he says, 'is in Mr. Beecher's [not Henry Ward but Thomas K. Beecher's] handwriting.' The scribe of the Association, 'who was an illiterate blunderer,' had written it and handed it to the moderator to sign. He glanced at it, and suddenly said, 'What's this? "The Susquehanna Association, having examined . . . commends him to the churches of Chr"—at the end of the line, with a hyphen, "ist" at the beginning of the next line! Is Christ divided? Give me a pen and let me write a certificate that will not disgrace this body.'

Nor was the inward call more formal than the outward. At the county school he had a teacher who 'found me a listless and lazy pupil; left me with a zest for study and a firm purpose of self-improvement.' It was a clear case of conversion. There seems to have been no other. After some years Bushnell was discovered and appropriated. 'That there was a gospel to preach I had no longer any doubt.' And what was the gospel? 'Religion is nothing but friendship; friendship with God and with men.' He knows that there is such a thing as Sonship. 'As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.' But how shall we discover who are led by the Spirit of God? Dr. Gladden's answer is immediate: 'By their fruits: we can only find them out by looking at their lives.' And by that test

Dr. Washington Gladden is a good follower of the Lord Jesus Christ.

His *Recollections* are trustworthy. There is no foolish modesty; there is no foolish self-praise. He has lived a heroic life, hating evil and suffering for his hatred. For four years he was a paid editor of the *Independent*. He left the office because certain advertisements were printed as if they were editorial matter. He left the office and had the wide world before him. But again he was called to the pulpit, and again he preached the gospel of 'Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you.'

THE RELIGION OF THE GREEKS.

In five volumes octavo, of many pages each, and illustrated by many very fine plates, Dr. L. R. Farnell has published a great history of the Religion of the Greeks. His chosen title is *The Cults of the Greek States* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press; 5 vols., 82s. 6d. net). He has not been able to accomplish all that he undertook to do. Though the originally contemplated three volumes have run to five, he has still had to leave unwritten that full account of the worship of heroes and of the dead which he purposed at the beginning. But what he has done is so well done that we are grateful. It is the best account of the Religion of Greece that has ever been written. It is such a work as a man who makes no special study of Greece or of Religion should make haste to possess. For it is one of the few works that combine the finest scientific research with the most artistic literary finish. And it will never lose its value.

The method and scope of the work were fully described after the issue of the first two volumes. With the issue of the fifth it becomes necessary to say something about the final three. But to go over the ground again would be a mistake. Let it suffice to say that the scope of the work includes the whole of the religion of Greece whether found in books or on monuments, whether seen in ritual or doctrine. And the method is to take up each cult separately, one after another. Thus the fifth volume describes the Cults of Hermes, the Cults of Dionysos, the Cults of Hestia, of Hephaistos, and of Ares; it closes with a chapter on the Minor Cults—the Nymphs, the Horai and Charites, the Eumenides, and the rest.

Dr. Farnell has spent twenty years on the work. He does not grudge it. To himself the thorough study of the Greek religion is not an end, it is a preparation. It is a preparation for the study of Comparative Religion. Twenty years ago he saw that Comparative Religion was about to be the great discipline of our time, and he resolved to prepare himself for it. He saw that the Greek religion would be the best preparation, because it reflects so vividly the higher and the lower workings of the religious sense. He therefore began a systematic study of that religion. And now his book is the best possible preparation for the study of Comparative Religion on our part. If there was one man who saw the importance of Comparative Religion twenty years ago, there are a hundred who see it now. And they see, what Dr. Farnell scarcely could have seen then, that even Comparative Religion is not a study whose end is with itself, but that it has become necessary for the defence of the truth and for the maintenance of the individual religious life and the spiritual well-being of the community.

SOME RECENT VOLUMES OF SERMONS.

There is no season in all our experience that has produced so many volumes of sermons as the publishing season of 1909-10. A number of volumes have been noticed already, a number have yet to be noticed.

The Hulsean Lectures are sermons. The lecturer for 1909-10 was the Rev. W. Edward Chadwick, D.D., B.Sc., the author of *The Pastoral Teaching of St. Paul*, and other books. He gave his lectures, and he gives his book, the title of *Social Relationships in the Light of Christianity* (Longmans; 5s. net). It is the great urgent problem of the present time. For it is not socialism that we need fear. It is socialism divorced from Christ. And then the evil of socialism would only be greater than the evil of rationalism in that the one laid captive the body; the other enslaved the mind. In unchristian socialism we might have to eat the bread of the homeless, but in unchristian rationalism (which is already on us and around us and there is no uneasiness) we are told and taught to curse God and die. Dr. Chadwick has studied his subject thoroughly. His Hulsean lectures go far beyond the ordinary volume of essays on the

social problem. The author is equipped on the one hand with a thorough knowledge of Christ, and on the other with a no less thorough knowledge of social conditions.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have undertaken the publication of the Rev. W. M. Clow's volume, *The Day of the Cross*, and have issued a new edition, enlarged by the addition of five new sermons (6s.). The evangelical note is unmistakable here. It is very pronounced. How otherwise? For the whole volume is occupied with one day in the life of Jesus, and that the day of His death. How could a man be other than evangelical in that proximity?

But if it is a question of evangelicalism, the Rev. J. G. Greenhough, M.A., one of the great Baptist preachers, will stand comparison with any man. His new volume is occupied with St. Paul. But its subject, as its title, is *The Mind of Christ in St. Paul* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). In St. Paul himself Mr. Greenhough is interested only as St. Paul was interested in Christ. The book is a preacher's presentation of the mind that was in St. Paul; but the mind that was in St. Paul was always the mind of Christ, and every text which starts with psychology ends with some aspect of the Atonement.

And if Mr. Greenhough is evangelical, what shall we call Dr. Campbell Morgan? Perhaps the distinction is this. To the fact of the Cross Dr. Campbell Morgan adds the record of it. He must have the Bible as well as Christ. He is not satisfied with the authority of Christ in his own life, nor with all the evidence of Christian experience in the past. He must have the Gospels equally impervious to criticism and equally authoritative. In this little book there is no discussion of the authority of the Bible, it is simply taken for granted. It is taken although Dr. Campbell Morgan knows quite well it is not granted in the way he takes it. The title is *The Bible and the Cross* (Hodder & Stoughton; 1s. 6d. net).

Dr. Pearson M'Adam Muir delivered the Baird Lecture in 1909. And the Baird Lecture is delivered in a series of sermons; we may therefore take in his book here also. But there is a subject and a system throughout, and the lectures are not ordinary sermons. The subject is *Modern Substitutes for Christianity* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). It recalls Flint's 'Anti-Theistic Theories'—perhaps the greatest of all the Baird Lectures.

But it is not given to Dr. M'Adam Muir to separate his substitutes for Christianity into compartments as Professor Flint did. The great difficulty of the modern apologist is that there is so much give and take, not only between Christianity and its rivals, but also among the rivals themselves. After a chapter on the 'Popular Impeachments of Christianity,' in which Mr. Blatchford's name figures freely, Dr. Muir recognizes the rise and influence of the ethical societies and deals with 'Morality without Religion.' Next follows a hunt after Pantheism, most elusive of all anti-theistic theories. Then Dr. Muir draws closer. From the religion of humanity he passes to Theism without Christ, and ends with the tribute of Criticism. It is a competent apologetic, but it will be relished most of all for the fine literary flavour that never forsakes it.

The Rev. H. O. Mackey gives himself to the honourable occupation of providing for the hungry preacher. His latest volume is unblushingly offered to 'busy people.' It is, as it is called, a volume of *Miniature Sermons* (Robert Scott; 2s. 6d. net). It is surprising that one can put so much interest into so little space. But it is the least of all this list. We have given it its place to punish our prejudice against skeletons.

Dr. Louis Albert Banks is the Talmage of to-day. His colours are not quite so loud as those with which Talmage delighted to work. But he has as many anecdotes to tell, and he tells them with quite as much dramatic abandonment. He has preached a long series of sermons for young people on the Book of Proverbs, and now he publishes them under the title of *The Problems of Youth* (Funk & Wagnalls; 6s.). The Book of Proverbs is very suitable for sermons to the young. It turns out to be very suitable for the kind of sermons Dr. Banks loves to preach. Here is one of the most striking and least startling of the anecdotes. In accordance with his method, Dr. Banks begins his sermon with it. 'In Baltimore one Sunday morning, as the people were going to church, a telegraph pole, large and strong and round, looking as stalwart as any other in the line, suddenly did a strange thing. Without any warning, like a great, strong man struck down by an unseen bullet, the pole groaned, and then, with a snapping, tearing, grinding sound, the upper portion fell to the street, leaving about twenty-five feet standing. The people looked on

and wondered. A crowd soon gathered, marvelling at what should have caused such a catastrophe. There was no hurricane, not even a brisk breeze, and surely not enough to sever such a pole as that, which had weathered so many storms. Just then a small boy began to climb the stump that was left, to investigate. When he reached the top, he found that right where the pole had broken was a scooped-out place where a pair of woodpeckers had cut out their nest, and there in the nest was a poor little woodpecker, frightened half to death. Unnoticed, but steadily, stroke after stroke, the birds had dug their way back into the heart of the great strong telegraph-pole, until they had sapped its strength.'

Canon Hensley Henson has included three sermons in the volume containing his Yale Lectures on Preaching, which allows us to take his volume into the present survey. The great difficulty which all the recent Yale Lecturers have had to contend with is the difficulty of finding something to say about preaching that has not been said at Yale already. But Canon Henson could not say what any one else had already said though he tried it. He deliberately does try to say what has been said, not by a Yale Lecturer, but by a Puritan poet. He calls his book *The Liberty of Prophesying* (Macmillan; 6s.), for the very purpose of saying that he is recovering and repeating Milton. But he is still himself, very individual and very modern. There never lived a man who made a greater resolve to speak the truth, as he understood it, to his own generation. Few men have lived who have suffered more for doing it. Canon Henson finds it very difficult to preach to-day. He gives five reasons for the difficulty—change of social custom in the matter of religious observance; fluidity of modern populations implying the failure of the old local conditions; brevity of modern sermons; free discussion of sacred subjects in the secular press; the baleful influence of the so-called religious newspapers, 'themselves the creatures and instruments of religious partizanship.' The last is not the least. What does he say about it? 'The preacher,' he says, 'who would criticize conventional beliefs, and pursue a course adverse to the prevailing policy of his church, must sustain the opposition of the religious, that is, of the party, press. His words will be torn from their context; distorted into senses which were foreign to his mind; paraded before an excited and

ignorant public without any of the reservations with which he had conditioned them. His explanations will be ignored: he may count himself fortunate if his personal character is not maligned. One of the gravest facts of our time is the power for evil of the "religious" press.'

If any preacher is in want of suggestions for a series of sermons, he will find them in *Trial and Triumph*, by the Rev. G. Arthur Sowter, M.A. (Nisbet; 3s. 6d. net). There is first a course on the great experiences—Sin, Repentance, Faith, Confession, Temptation, Prayer, Fasting. There is next a course on the great disciplines—Temptation, Toil, Disappointment, Loneliness, Failure, Suffering. Then there is a course on the relation of our Lord to death—Christ foretelling Death, Christ praying before Death, and so on. And last of all there are three Eastertide messages—'the Risen Lord,' 'the First and the Last,' and 'Hope, Riches, Power.'

The three sermons which Dr. John Kelman has published in *The Courts of the Temple* (Oliphant, Anderson, & Ferrier; 1s. net) have distinction enough to demand a place in this survey, though they are so few and the volume is so unassuming. One sermon is on Art and Religion, one on Commerce and Religion, and one on Industry and Religion. It is Glasgow that has the motto, 'Let Glasgow flourish by the preaching of the Word.' But the preaching of the Word has done more to make Edinburgh what it is than any other single influence. And this is the preaching that has done it. It is eminently suitable to such a city, with its variety of interest, with its acceptance of the intellect in everything. But it is also eminently faithful to the simplicity which is in Christ.

What is this new enterprise of the Rev. J. Henry Burn, B.D.? He calls it *The Churchman's Pulpit* (Griffiths). It is to be published in weekly parts, at 1s. 6d. net each; and occasionally there are to be double parts at 3s. 6d. net, and special parts at 5s. net. The page is a very large octavo, very closely printed, so that each part has plenty of matter for the money. But what are the sermons? New or old? Complete or condensed? Some are surely new, and some are certainly old; and it is probable that the new are complete, and the old condensed. Thus we have F. W. Robertson—unless Mr. Burn has discovered a manuscript in a red box. But there is also the Rev. T. T. Carter with six eloquent sermons on the Imitation of

Christ; and there is the late Dr. Frederick Field, the great Old Testament scholar, to whose manuscripts we know that Mr. Burn has the special privilege of access. Well, it is a most promising undertaking. Mr. Burn does nothing without doing it well.

We have left two outstanding volumes of Methodist sermons to the last.

The Rev. Thomas G. Selby is a master in the art of making sermons. And it seems as if every sermon he made were fit for publishing. He has published many volumes, but never a better than this. Its title is *The Divine Craftsman* (Culley; 3s. 6d.). The sermon that has attracted us most we have found in the very middle of the book. Its text is 'The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him; and he will show them his covenant' (Ps 25¹⁴). It is the subject of all subjects that seems to need most emphasis now. It is the Psalmist's way of saying that only the pure in heart shall see God. There is a radius, says Mr. Selby, within which God is at home. And he adds this illustration: 'The note of the nightingale is heard within fixed geographical frontiers. It never sings north of York, or west of the river Exe. Its eggs have been hatched under other birds in both Scotland and Wales, but the fledglings, after taking their departure, never return in the following spring to make midnight music. And the sweet notes which whisper the love of the Eternal Friend are only heard within strict ethical frontiers.'

Dr. J. Scott Lidgett's volume is called *Sermons and Addresses*, and it is more addresses than sermons. Most of its contents, he says, 'were strictly official utterances delivered by me as President of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference.' He seems to think he may be challenged for publishing discourses which have been delivered on different occasions. His reply is that they fit together and form a connected whole. 'They are an attempt to show the inclusiveness of the spiritual life and to set forth the way in which many great causes which appeal to Christians in the present day, notably Evangelism, Foreign Missions, Social Reform, and Christian Reunion, are related to Faith in Christ and to the service of His Kingdom.' Among the rest there is a thoroughly wholesome address on Holiness. It was delivered at the Southport Holiness Convention in July 1909. It is a model of exegetical accuracy for the

use of all Convention speakers. The title of the book is *Apostolic Ministry* (Culley; 3s. 6d. net).

The Fascinating Study of Religion.

'We need constantly to remind ourselves that although life *has* its pleasures, it *is* a serious business, and that if there are many subjects we *may* study, there are some we *must* study if we are to live successfully.' So says the Rev. H. Montague Dale, M.A., B.D., Vicar of Christ Church, Summerfield, Birmingham. And then he says that the first of all the subjects which we must study is Comparative Religion. Religion, he says, demands our study because of its prevalence, persistence, and power. But what is to be our method of study? 'The comparative method has proved so valuable in the sciences, that it may be said that they became truly scientific through the application of that method. For example, anatomy became a real science when a comparison of structures was commenced. And if there is to be a true science of religion, it must be through the employment of that method which "recognizes, when it sees begin in the leaf, the structural plan or purpose which finds its culmination in the glorious form and moving image of man."'

We congratulate Mr. Dale on his insight. Some of his brethren cannot see it yet. They think it safer to confine themselves to Christianity. Mr. Dale has written a most agreeable introduction to the study of Religion, under the title of *Religion: Its Place and Power* (Allenson; 3s. 6d. net).

A New Synopticon.

Mr. J. M. Thompson, whose book entitled *Jesus according to St. Mark* has already given him a good introduction, has now arranged the Synoptic Gospels in parallel columns after the manner of Rushbrooke's *Synopticon*. Mr. Thompson, however, is Revised Version, while Rushbrooke is original Greek. First, he prints St. Mark consecutively, in paragraphs, and in parallel columns the corresponding passages in St. Matthew and in St. Luke. Next, he prints St. Matthew and St. Luke where they are independent of St. Mark and parallel. And last of all, he prints in parallel columns all the matter that is still left over. The whole work is most workmanlike, editor, printer, and publisher having co-operated harmoniously. The title is simply *The Synoptic Gospels* (Clarendon Press; 7s. 6d. net).

Historical and Linguistic Studies.

The University of Chicago continues the issue of its series of 'Historical and Linguistic Studies in the Literature of the New Testament.' Dr. C. K. Staudt has written a monograph on *The Idea of the Resurrection in the Ante-Nicene Period* (54 cents); and Dr. J. C. Granbery has written *An Outline of New Testament Christology* (56 cents).

The British School at Athens.

Messrs. Macmillan have published the fourteenth yearly volume of *The Annual of the British School at Athens* (25s. net). It covers the work done during the session 1907 to 1908.

If it were not inconvenient to play hide-and-seek with the title of a society, the British School at Athens should in 1908 have been called the British School at Sparta. For at Sparta its work was done. Work began on the 23rd of March, and lasted till the end of May. The greater part of that time was occupied with the excavation of the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia. The staff consisted of the Director (Mr. R. M. Dawkins, of Emmanuel College, Cambridge) and six assistants. One of the assistants, however, Mr. Dickins, completed the excavation of the site of the Hieron of Athena Chalkioikos, which he had begun the year before, while Mr. Woodward searched for inscriptions.

The results were not sensational. At least, there was no single sensational result. But no one can go through this volume, with its mass of matter and its multitude of illustrations, without seeing that the whole result of the season's work is quite impressive.

But the British School at Athens renders a higher service than can be expressed by material results. At the annual meeting of the subscribers the chair was taken and the address delivered by Lord Cromer. It must have been a surprise to the subscribers present to hear Lord Cromer argue against specialization. It must have been with difficulty that they smiled when he told this story: 'Some twenty-five years ago, when the Government of Mr. Gladstone decided not to maintain Egyptian authority in the Soudan, I received a visit from a gentleman of high scientific attainments who had devoted most of his very useful life to the study of botany. He was very indignant with the British Government, and his indignation was, to a great extent, based on the fact, that one of the most remote of the districts

which were about to lapse into unredeemed barbarism was the only spot on the earth which produced a certain species of trefoil.'

What, then, is the service which the British School at Athens renders? It teaches men that education is something more than preparation for obtaining immediate results. It develops, says Lord Cromer, that Megalopsuchia which is so essential to youths who are destined to take their share in the government and administration of an Empire that is world wide. And lest any one should think that this greatness of soul is akin to 'swollen head,' 'Let me remark,' says Lord Cromer—'in case I should be misunderstood by any who are not amongst my present audience, and who may perhaps think that I am advocating some novel and objectionably aggressive form of Imperialism—that Megalopsuchia, which is admirable, is not in any way to be confounded with Megalomania, which is altogether detestable.'

For the Work of the Ministry.

The objection to the Yale Lectures on Preaching, of which the latest volume is among the books of the month, is that they are occupied with only one aspect of our high calling. That is because they belong to a series. Every new lecturer feels that he must break new ground. The Rev. W. H. Harrowes, M.A., Minister of St. Enoch's United Free Church, Glasgow, has omitted nothing in his volume entitled *The Minister and his Work* (Melrose; 3s. 6d. net). He has omitted nothing, and he is sane and sensible on everything. The Yale lecturer recognizes that he must be brilliant, so many brilliant lecturers having preceded him. Mr. Harrowes is under no such compulsion. He is evidently determined to be good, and let who will be clever—good as a minister, and good as an educator of other ministers. There is one chapter of his book to which we have been specially drawn. It is the chapter on 'Public Prayer.' Mr. Harrowes writes for those who have to learn to pray in public. How well he writes; how evidently out of a hard and probably humiliating experience. After all, this *is* brilliance.

The Papal Conquest.

Dr. Alexander Robertson of Venice is the uncompromising foe of the Pope of Rome and all that the Pope of Rome stands for. To his new book he has given the title of *The Papal Conquest*

(Morgan & Scott; 6s.). Its sub-title is 'Italy's Warning—Wake Up, John Bull!' For the book is addressed not to Italians, but to Englishmen. The papal conquest is the conquest of England. Dr. Robertson believes that 'this Roman Catholic organization—"wickedly miscalled a Church," to use again the words of *Punch*—is of this world, is only a political institution aiming at temporal wealth and power'; and that therefore, in every country where it exists, it is the enemy of that country. 'This,' he says, 'is a matter of history, and a matter of everyday observation and fact.' Now he holds that England alone blocks the way to the recovery of the temporal dominion of the Church, and that the Roman Curia is now working as it never worked before for the conquest and humiliation of England. The book is written with tremendous energy, and it is illustrated in the most startling fashion by cartoons taken from the *Asino*—'a paper,' says Dr. Robertson, 'which exists in Italy for the express purpose of vindicating Christ and Christianity from the vile caricature of both presented by the Papal Church.'

History, Authority, and Theology.

The Principal of King's College is an ecclesiastical theologian. He is not a theologian pure and simple. He is greatly interested in theology; but theology is not his chief interest. Its place is in his head, it does not hold his heart. And *pectus facit theologum*. Nor is he a historian pure and simple. He is interested in history, but it is the history of the Church. And it is the history of the Church, not with the detachment of a scientific historian, but with the attachment of a defender of the Church of England.

Dr. Headlam believes heartily in the Church of England. Let us listen to him. 'The present writer,' he says, 'starts from a natural *præjudicium* which is created by being a member of the English Church. He no more approaches the question with an open mind than a member of the Roman or of the Nonconformist bodies. But it has been his duty to investigate for himself the authority and the status of the Church to which he belongs. It is a confession which at the present day it may be very unfashionable to make, that the result of his investigations has been to strengthen his conviction that the Church of England is an adequate though not infallible representative of the Christian society, and in particular that the logical position

on which the Church rests is sound. It is the custom to believe that the English Church is the creation of political compromise. That position I believe to be entirely untrue. The principle of the English Church is that its standard of truth is the Old and the New Testaments as interpreted by Christian history and tradition. The actual process pursued at the English Reformation was not to attempt to re-construct the Church anew from the beginning, but to cut away such mediæval abuses and accretions as had been shown to be without authority and harmful. In both cases the principle seems to my mind absolutely sound. The method of reform was the right one, and the result, historical continuity combined with adaptation to the needs of the day, represents the combination of the two principles of government which are most essential to the well-being of a nation and of a church.'

The volume, of which the title is *History, Authority, and Theology* (Murray; 6s. net), consists of an introductory essay from which the quotation has been taken, and seven other essays, all of them dealing with theology in some relation or other to the Church of England. Even the essay on the New Theology has that reference, and it is the clearer and more convincing for having it.

Switzerland of the Swiss.

Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons are the publishers of a series of volumes which look like, but must not be mistaken for, guide-books. We have already reviewed *Italy of the Italians*. The new volume is *Switzerland of the Swiss* (6s. net). Whether the ordinary guide-book is a necessary addition to one's luggage or not may be a matter of dispute; the particular volume of this series is not necessary. But that is simply because it must be mastered before one begins the journey. It is not well fitted for reading by the way; its seriousness is too sustained. But if it is read beforehand, twice over if possible, the most ordinary Briton may travel in Switzerland, or whatever the country may be, with confidence and with steadily increasing advantage. Geography, history, politics, art, religion—everything is here, and everything is in reliable order. The illustrations may be found elsewhere, but better illustrations will not be found.

Judaism.

The Rev. Morris Joseph has revised his book on *Judaism as Creed and Life*, and had it reset. The second edition, therefore, supersedes the first, and yet it is much cheaper (Routledge; 3s. 6d.).

Ancient Manuscripts.

Mr. Elliot Stock has published a Guide to the Reading of Ancient Manuscripts, under the title of *How to Decipher and Study Old Documents* (5s. net). It is a beginner's book. Much of it could be discovered by the beginner himself, and it would be better for him to discover it. But it proceeds to deeper things and more difficult. The chapter on 'Law Technicalities' is useful, and it would have been more useful if there had been more of it. For the greatest difficulty to the understanding of the 'Family Deed Chest' is not their handwriting, but the technical law language in which the deeds are drawn up.

Directories and Year-Books.

Messrs. Nisbet have published their *Church Directory and Almanack* for 1910 (2s. net). It is such a miracle of reliability and inexpensiveness that we wonder who continues to buy the dearer directories.

The *Church Pulpit Year-Book* (2s. net) is enlarged by sixteen pages, these pages being devoted to a series of addresses for men. It is, so far as we know, the first time that the Pleasant Sunday Afternoon has been recognized, either officially or semi-officially. In our judgment this will be the most popular part of the book.

The *Church of Scotland Year-Book* is ideally edited by the Rev. William Simpson of Bonhill. The volume for 1910 differs from the volume for 1909 in the number of the year, and in other figures. And no doubt there are new names that take the place of the old who will never be seen in the Year-Book again. But it is the same book. It is published by Messrs. R. & R. Clark (6d.).

The *Scottish Church and University Almanac* (Macniven & Wallace; 1s. net) is as indispensable to a Scottish minister as a Dictionary of the Bible.

What is a Christian?

BY THE REV. G. A. JOHNSTON ROSS, M.A., BRYN MAWR, PENNSYLVANIA.

THERE is a stage in the religious interest when there is a peculiar fascination in the definition of what precisely constitutes religion in the individual: this paper is an attempt, if not at definition, at least at description of what constitutes personal religion in Christian men. I well remember the expectant interest with which I went in my student days to St. Giles' Cathedral, Edinburgh, to hear Dr. Marcus Dods preach on 'What is a Christian?' I cannot now remember much of the sermon, but I do very vividly recall the reason for one's eager interest. In the preaching (at least the evangelistic preaching) of those days a very sharp distinction was drawn between those who are in the Kingdom and those who are without; and some of us young people (for whom it was hardly possible in the immaturity of our knowledge of life to feel that we had fully yielded to the vaguely conceived claims of God)—some of us went daily haunted by misgivings as to whether we really had or had not been 'received into the fold of Christ.' What precisely constituted a Christian,—what (I mean) in belief or surrender or personal habit or attitude,—was of vital interest to us. In the matter of these misgivings and anxieties the present generation is frankly a puzzle to me: I cannot make out how far such anxieties exist,—they are so veiled in 'theological difficulties' or by light-hearted demeanour. But I do not think there is less need than there used to be to arrive at a true idea of the essential contents of Christianhood. Let us try to get at the heart of the matter without technical language, and by way of description.

I take it, then, that in the broadest sense, the religious man is he who feels and owns the pressure of the moral and spiritual ideal upon him, and is endeavouring in some fashion to pay heed and respond to the pressure; and that the personal religion is *Christian* when the Ideal is conceived as Jesus Christ would have us conceive it. Now it is not difficult, I think, to recognize Jesus Christ's interpretation of the Ideal, at least in its main emphases. To begin with, that Ideal which from outside the visible order (in which we struggle for bread, for knowledge, for wealth, for recognition) makes itself felt within us as a moral Pressure and

Summons—this Jesus declared to be the presence of a Personal Being, to be identified with the Eternal Fount and Origin of our life and with what we call Providence. This Person works within us as Mind conveying His meaning to our minds in rational but uniquely intimate ways. That 'God' is *personal* as Father, and that He is *intimate* as Spirit, these together make the first of Christ's emphases in His interpretation of the moral and spiritual Summons we hear within us. Next, Jesus taught the all-embracing power of this spiritual Person whom we hear within. I do not know whether Jesus was a 'monist' or not: He certainly treated evil as a grim reality; but I am sure He so believed in the supremacy of God and in the universality of His interest as to hold firmly *the potential unity of all persons in Him*. Next, Jesus taught that this spiritual Presence is holy—holy beyond our thought; and, finally,—with most emphasis of all,—He taught that an unaltering Love dwells at the heart of this Urgency that is upon us, and that it is Love-in-sacrifice.

Now let us return to our question, 'What is a Christian?' It is obvious that if a Christian is one who endeavours to respond to the ideal as *Jesus conceived it*, we have in these 'emphases' of Jesus the leading 'notes' of the Christian life—Spiritual Personality, Unity, Infinite Holiness, and Love-in-sacrifice: these are the brief summaries of the Christian's distinctive aspirations.

Let me try in a sentence or two to make this clear. First, to the man who accepts Christ's rendering of the facts of the moral life, there is at the centre of his life, as its most sacred experience, a personal relationship of august obligations, and a personal spiritual action welcomed and valued above all else. Now to such a man, *persons will mean more than things*, and spiritual values more than material values. He will judge that a man's life consists not in what he possesses, but in the spirit which possesses him. The character of those he loves; loyalties in friendship; the maintenance in public and domestic life of clean motive and untarnished honour,—in a word, all that exalts the spiritual in personal life will interest and attract him most. Next, if Christ's emphasis on the

comprehensiveness of God's sphere of influence and on the potential unity of all persons in Him has laid hold of a man, *the expansion of that man's sympathy* is inevitable,—the passion for unity, the dread and hate of the exclusive spirit, will certainly take hold of him. He will become, as St. Ignatius, writing to the Philadelphians described himself, 'a man knit together for unity.' Again, the emphasis on the exalted height of God's holiness means for the Christian *infinitude of aspiration and infinitude of duty*. This is the basal paradox of the Christian life: it is haunted by the infinite,—by that which in the field of striving combines the stimulating and the hopeless. 'We are saved in hope.' And then, lastly, the emphasis on Love-in-sacrifice produces the most characteristic note of the Christian life,—it is *in love with sacrifice*. Christ taught that God's very life is love,—that He *is* Himself because He *gives* Himself: and the paradox is reproduced in the Christian. Only, that which God wholly is, the Christian only partly is. He knows that fullest life is in self-giving; but the spirit of self-indulgence struggles with the spirit of self-offering. And it is because of this inner contradiction and conflict that the attitude of

'dependence on Christ' is forced upon the Christian. One moment aspiring toward the infinite, the next yielding to self-indulging ease, he needs to cast himself on One who, being otherwise one with him, yet represents in permanence that which in him is but fugitive and intermittent. So the Christian escapes from himself in Christ. And if any one say that this is unreal, the Christian man answers, 'But what else can I do? I hear the summons of the infinitely holy God to be like Himself, and I astir to respond. But the weight dragging me back seems as great as the power that calls me to rise. I can do naught else than take refuge from the conflict in God Himself!'

I do not see, then, how the essentials of Christian personal religion can be reduced much further than to these four elements, with their discipline, their contradictions, their promise, and their present issue in the attitude of 'sheltering in Christ' of which our fathers had so much to say.

But I wonder how far that attitude of escape in Christ—how far the confessed paradox of being now alone with the Supreme, and now flying for refuge to a Mediator—is in our day experienced?

In the Study.

The Depreciation of the Priceless.

'It might have been sold' (Mk 14^b).

THE suggestion came from Judas. That was all he could find to say about the precious ointment poured forth from its alabaster vase in the service of love.

The picture is before us—the Bethany circle uniting to do honour to Jesus. The Master is in the place of honour. The disciples are near. Martha is waiting at table. Lazarus looks out on things with the light of his second life in his eyes. Mary, with the inner vision of a loving heart, reads in the Master's face a shadow of things to come. There is a hush in the talking. Mary kneels at the Master's feet; the vase is broken; the perfume floats through the room. A silence follows, a silence in which love eternal is trying to say something to each man's heart. Then, as is often the case in life, the first man to break the silence

is the man to whom the silence has said nothing. 'It might have been sold.'

It was bad taste, we say. Judas mishandled a beautiful situation. Judas took a business view of the scene, when he ought to have looked at it artistically.

It was more than bad taste. The real charge against Judas is, not that he took a business view, but that he got no view at all. If he sinned against art, it was not art as it is interpreted by the æsthetic temperament, with its not seldom false and uncatholic view of a workaday world, with its profound conviction that a man who paints pictures must be altogether superior to a man who makes boots—it was against art as it stands for the unpurchasable and imperishable and eternal—and that is the fabric of man's true life. That little pale-faced mite who stopped you in the street yesterday as you were carrying home a bunch of flowers to your wife, and said, 'Give me

a flower,' was not a beggar. She was an artist. It was her response to the vision beautiful, her plea for the priceless. It was a voice confessing amid the rattle of the street that 'man doth not live by bread alone.'

Judas was not a worse man for keeping the bag. Some one must keep it. The pity of it was that Judas had come to believe that the bag could keep him. It is a peril against which we too must be on our guard—not specifically as business men, for this is not essentially a peril of the marketplace. It is the danger of becoming lost in the temporalities, earth-fed and earth-filled. Only a shallow and unspiritual judgment will think less of Judas for knowing the selling-price of alabaster and nard. His sin lay in that he had lost the power to see in these things a sacrament of 'the life that is life indeed.'

Do we say that his suggestion is right 'so far as it goes'? That the ointment *could* have been sold, and the money *could* have been spent on the poor? It is no vindication. A thing has to go a certain distance before it begins to be true. It has to touch the spiritual and eternal in life. And Judas missed that. And so this man, with his market price and his mental arithmetic, was not an intruder—he was an outsider.

O these priceless things—how we miss them. How Jesus pleaded for them. Judas had accompanied with that unworldly life, had heard the Master say that the widow's farthing was worth more than the jewels of the rich, and yet he had not learned that there are things which cannot be bought and sold. You can buy a book of poems, but you cannot buy a poem. The poem is yours only as the unpurchasable gift of God to your soul. You cannot buy a home, a happy hour, a good conscience, or a rich hope. It is worth telling again, for it is the doctrine of grace—God's mercy for the undeserving, His treasure for the poor, His fulness for the empty.

'It might have been sold.'

'That is, I think, the most vulgar remark on record. How that wonder of love in Simon's house was cheapened for the man from Iscariot! How the shadow of a material judgment obscured for him the spiritual dignity and glory of Mary's service! Judas did not know what he was dealing with. He may have been an authority on spikenard. Perhaps he could have told us the precise meaning of that strange word *pistikes*,

which St. Mark used to describe the ointment, and which bids fair to remain one of the minor puzzles of his Gospel. But he was not dealing with alabaster and spikenard. And, my friends, we never are. Life is made up of things that defy all valuation by this world's standard—things the worth of which can only be expressed in that mystic coinage that is stamped with the image of One wearing a crown of thorns, and has for its superscription, "Ye did it unto Me."

And now, let us follow Judas from Simon's house to the house of his Master's enemies. We must do this. We cannot deal with the three hundred pence and say nothing about the thirty pieces of silver, for they are part of the same calculation. The man who cannot see the priceless is quite capable of selling it. That is the logic of history. That is the tragedy of materialism.

This 'study' comes from a volume of sermons entitled *The Pilgrim Church* (Culley; 3s. 6d. net). The sermons were preached by the Rev. Percy Clough Ainsworth, who died on the first day of July 1909 at the age of thirty-six. And there is not a sermon in the book but could be made a study of—as fertile, as felicitous as this.

The Old Testament Doctrine of the Spirit.

Three of the books of the month deal with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Principal Adeney has written a beginner's book on *The Christian Conception of God* (Thomas Law; 2s. 6d. net). It is a beginner's book; but it is not the book of a beginner. Only a man of Dr. Adeney's knowledge could write so simply. Only a man of Dr. Adeney's experience could write so humbly. The chapter on the Holy Spirit is itself unmistakable evidence of the Spirit's grace and power.

'The idea of the Holy Spirit,' says Dr. Adeney, 'is entirely a Biblical and more especially a New Testament idea in its origin and authority.' Yet he does not mean to say that God's Spirit has not been felt influencing any men and women except Jews and Christians. Surely, he says, 'the impartial Father of all must be believed to have breathed His helping Spirit into His human family of all races and in all ages in so far as the several peoples were able to receive the heavenly gift.

When Socrates speaks of the spirit that he calls a *daimonion* as a voice within him to warn him against a wrong course, the Christian may say that this was as truly an influence of God's Holy Spirit as that experienced by St. Paul when, as St. Luke tells us, he was "forbidden of the Holy Ghost" to take a certain course that he was contemplating.'

But our purpose at present is to say something about the Spirit in the Old Testament, and for that we shall pass to another book.

The Rev. John Adams, B.D., of Inverkeillor, has already written 'Studies in the Hebrew Accents' and 'Studies in the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament,' two remarkable books which show men the way to find sermons in the syntax and in the accents of the Old Testament Hebrew. Both books have been successful. Mr. Adams has now published another volume of Studies—this time 'Studies in Old Testament Theology.' His title is *Israel's Ideal* (T. & T. Clark; 4s. 6d. net).

The book is a surprise—unless one's faculty of surprise has already been exhausted by the wonder of the volumes on the Syntax and the Accents. It is a surprise to discover that a comparatively small volume on the Theology of the Old Testament can be complete and clear, and at the same time can offer the preacher almost innumerable points for the fresh presentation of the Gospel as it is found in the Old Testament. But our purpose at present is to look at one chapter of the book, the chapter on the Old Testament Doctrine of the Spirit.

Mr. Adams, being a preacher as well as a scholar, divides his chapter into three parts. First he speaks of the Cosmical Spirit, next of the Theocratic Spirit, and then of the Spirit in Regeneration. That division covers the whole Old Testament doctrine of the Spirit; and we do not know a clearer or a better division. Mr. Adams is a student of Comparative Religion. Describing the cosmical spirit, he draws his analogies and illustrations from the Ojibways, from the Eastern Africans, from Aristotle and Plutarch, or from the modern Mongols. We cannot understand the very beginnings of the Old Testament doctrine of the Spirit without some study of the general subject of Animism.

Mr. Adams summarizes the Old Testament description of the Cosmical Spirit. First, it is the principle of *animation*. The chief texts are Gn 1²,

Ps 33⁶, Is 40¹³. Next, it is the principle of *intelligence* in man. 'God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul'—Gn 2⁷; also Job 33⁴ 32⁸. Finally, it leads into the sphere of *ethics*. The chief text is Ps 104³⁰; then Ps 51¹¹ and Ps 16⁷. In the last the voice of God is recognized even in the dictates of the conscience.

We pass from the Cosmical Spirit to the Theocratic when the *Ruach Elohim* becomes the *Ruach Yahweh*. 'If the former be the principle of animation, the latter is the spirit of revelation. If the one finds its sphere of operation in the creation and preservation of the world, the other is the spirit and guide of the theocracy.' This section is throughout admirable, but does not admit of condensation.

The third division is the Spirit in Regeneration. Mr. Adams does not find that regeneration by the Spirit is taught in the Old Testament as a clearly defined doctrine, although it is experienced as a spiritual fact. He makes this distinction amongst others, that in the Old Testament it is an influence exerted *upon* the soul, not a dwelling of the Divine Spirit *within* the soul. Again, he says, the *Ruach Yahweh* is associated with the bestowal of moral qualities, but not yet regarded as the source of holiness in man. He ends by showing that in three respects the Old Testament doctrine of the Spirit looks to the New for its completion and crown—with respect to the Spirit's *personality*, with respect to the *recipients* of the Spirit's influence, with respect to the nature of the Spirit's *work*.

The third book is occupied entirely with the doctrine of the Spirit. It is the first attempt that has been made to present in English a complete account of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in touch with modern scholarship. The author is the Rev. Arthur Cleveland Downer, M.A., D.D., of Brasenose College, Oxford. The title is *The Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit* (T. & T. Clark; 7s. 6d. net).

It is, we say, a complete account of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. And it is only when we read a complete account of the doctrine that we understand why there has been so much misapprehension among us, and so much mistaken and even mischievous writing, about the Holy Spirit. Why this doctrine more than any other should be presented to us in fragments it is not easy to explain. It is just possible that every man inter-

pretends his own experience and in interpreting it by itself regards it out of proportion. But the result has been to make the impression that a consistent doctrine of the Holy Spirit is not to be found in Scripture, and, which is still worse, that such fragments of a doctrine as are to be found there do not agree with our experience.

Dr. Downer has written on the whole subject within reasonable compass, with a fine command of the English language, as well as with a thorough modern knowledge of the doctrine and of all that is essential in its vast literature. His book, with all its modesty, will be found to be indispensable.

The chapter on the Old Testament Doctrine of the Spirit is shorter than the chapter in Mr. Adams's book. Like Mr. Adams, Dr. Downer starts with the Spirit as the Giver of life. He

is the Giver of life (1) in Nature, (2) in man, (3) in grace, (4) in the Jewish nation, and (5) in the predicted Messiah. Thus the method is different from that of Mr. Adams; but there is no contradiction. As the Giver of life in man the Spirit of God makes His voice heard (*a*) in Conscience, (*b*) through the Prophets, (*c*) in the Law, (*d*) in the Types, (*e*) in the Great Lyric, and (*f*) in various Old Testament Characters. Dr. Downer is at one with Mr. Adams in representing the Holy Spirit's work of grace as foreshadowed in the Old Testament but fulfilled only in the New. And it is not simply that a fuller revelation came in with Christ, but that Christ Himself was the fuller revelation; and again, not in what He said or did but in what He was—in short, that He was Himself the abode of the Spirit.

The Aristocratic Element in Religion.

BY THE REV. W. R. THOMSON, B.D., GLASGOW.

'The method of God is aristocratic,' says Mr. Joseph Leckie, in a timely and very interesting little book¹ on a subject whose pressure is always felt in an age of religious unrest. The raising of the question of Authority—its reality, source, and organ—is not necessarily a sign of scepticism. It may be a symbol of genuine religious interest and an effort of faith to justify its own certainties. There is, perhaps, no subject in regard to which the spirit of treatment counts for so much. It is here Mr. Leckie achieves real distinction. His work has not only literary merit of a high order, it comes to us out of an atmosphere of quietness. It may be said of this little book that it neither strives nor cries, that, while sensitive to all that is going on in the theological arena, it dwells in a region where the jangle of polemics is at least softened by distance. Too often the discussion of authority has been the attempt to pull down—with but scant regard for the sanctities of time and custom—the fabrics under which other men have sheltered. Mr. Leckie chooses, to our mind, a better way. For it is well to recognize that there is something at once inevitable and yet provisional in the shelters men rear for their spiritual security.

The canopy of Church or Bible is only an evil when it is mistaken for the heavens.

The question of authority is only really relevant in a universe that is conceived to be intelligible, and that has at its heart ethical purposiveness. There can, in other words, only be authority to which a free spirit can be in bondage in a world where God is. In a universe construed in accord with the creed of naturalism, the question is hardly intelligible. For authority to be truly from within must be from above; and if there is nothing above man, there can be nothing but the coercion of force, or at the best a prudent regard for conventions which are more or less skilful makeshifts. No one has shown this more strikingly than Mr. Balfour in the earlier and critical part of his *Foundations of Belief*, where it is pointed out that neither the intuitions of art nor religion are explicable in a world where the spirit of beauty and goodness is but a chance product and not enthroned as a regal principle. It may be doubted, indeed, whether what is known as spiritual Monism admits of any satisfactory explanation of the fact of authority. Only a personality can recognize and yield to authority in the true sense of the word, and an authority which is held to be that of a divine principle to which we hesitate

¹ *Authority in Religion*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909.

to ascribe personality is, after all is said, something less than man. It may offer a fascinating problem to the intellect; whether it can constrain the will and touch the emotions to high issues is another matter. Hence Mr. Leckie frankly declines to discuss authority except on the assumption of Theism. The correspondences which man's spiritual life maintains with its environment are in essence of the nature of personal intercourse. However great may be the theoretic difficulties which confront the theistic view, the fact remains that the ecstasies of the artist and the construction of the philosopher, no less than the ardours of the prophet and the raptures of the saint, are personal responses to visions of beauty, truth, and goodness, which have only significance in the realm of personal life. In the simple language of religion, authority is God's power over the soul, to awaken faith and to constrain conduct. It is, from another point of view, the soul finding the universe 'convincing'—to make use of a too frequently used word—and conviction is always a personal experience.

Authority must primarily be mediated through persons. It is here that the aristocratic element in religion is revealed. It is only in a derivative sense that an institution or a book or an official can be the organ of authority. God's greatest words are spoken through elect lives. God and the soul are face to face, and the condition of authority is communion. While this assertion carries with it the denial of an infallible Church or an infallible Scripture, it does not really detract from the authority of the Church as the home of elect souls, or from the sanctity of Scripture as the record of their utterances. Nor does it deny the validity of what may be called the democratic element in the Church. For the common consciousness of the Church gathers within itself and retains, though it may be in earthen vessels, the treasure lavished on it by prophets and saints. It may be said, indeed, that to regard the soul as the supreme organ of authority in religion is to take up dangerously subjective ground. Do we not require something more stable and abiding than an inward experience? But what is a Church or a Bible but just an embodiment of this inward thing, a vesture that clothes it more or less adequately, and derives all its worth from the life it reveals? Mr. Leckie quotes a striking saying of the late R. H. Hutton: 'That Christianity which alone

can conquer the earth will be a faith neither so entirely rooted in mind and spiritual emotion as that of Luther, nor so studiously reflected in secondary organs and external institutions as that of Rome.' That is to say, we are warned against subjectivism on the one hand, and institutionalism on the other. But the subjective is soon corrected in the large world of spiritual life. Souls try souls, and experience tests all. The only thing that is more striking than the loneliness of a great soul is its capacity for communion and its power to inspire it, its power to enrich—one had almost said, to create—a common life that nourishes countless spirits. No man, and least of all the aristocrat in religion, lives unto himself. Nor does he die unto himself. His very cross becomes the heritage of mankind. There is nothing more intimate than a religious experience. But, on the other hand, there is nothing more expansive and inclusive than personality. It lives by sharing. 'He that loseth his life shall find it.' The rapture of the saint is attested most truly to be of God when it has been communicated to other souls. Prophets are few. But the Master's word must not be forgotten. We may receive a prophet in the name of a prophet, and so get a prophet's reward.

In these days when the fabric of Rome is being assailed by modernism, and when historical criticism has so transformed the Bible that it is no longer possible to declare inerrancy to be one of its notes, it is well to remember that the true strength of religion lies in the region of personal conviction and power. Indeed, the ideas of infallibility and inerrancy are more intellectual than religious. They are conceived with the object of buttressing religion from without. They arise in obedience to the demands of logic rather than of faith. They are in some degree abstract—abstractions from the rich concrete of religious experience. But religion must ever fear the abstract. This is not to say that the Church may not possess an august authority, mediated through her services and her teaching, and, in a secondary sense, through her creeds; or that the Bible may not speak with power to the hearts of men. But it is to say that the real testimony of the Church—the testimony that attests her as a true witness to divine things—is delivered in spite of her doctrine of infallibility; and, further, that men will more readily believe in the inspiration of the Bible,

because the Word has found and moved them, than begin with a hard-and-fast theory of inspiration and go on to accept what they regard as its logical consequences. The aristocratic element in the Church is not to be sought in her doctrine of infallibility, but in her sense of communion. The aristocratic note is heard less in the sonorous recitation of her creeds than in the prayers and aspirations of her choicer spirits. And since authority is personal and mediated through persons, its highest manifestation will be in the life that sustains the clearest and fullest communion with God. Mr. Leckie's chapter on the authority of Christ is full of reverence and wisdom. The

Master, dwelling at the heart of things, has a wonderful power to bring us face to face with the realities of the spirit. There is something tremendously simple about the authority of Christ. The great doctrine of His Person is a noble attempt to account for that authority, but in regard even to the most august doctrines we are in the region of theory, where the categories of thought grapple with the transcendent facts of life. But faith has its reasons which the intellect may never fully formulate. It is for faith that Jesus is the supreme aristocrat, whose place is by the throne. To faith He speaks the last word on all that pertains to the essential life of mankind.

Contributions and Comments.

A Gaelic Gloss from Bobbio.

In the Latin Psalter of Columbanus of Bobbio, in which the marginal notes are in Gaelic, the comment on the words 'Mine ankles have not slipped' (Ps 136) is 'Weariness comes not to my bones, though I travel firmly and for ever.'

The ancient Gaelic Commentator appreciates the special importance which the Psalmist associated with the ankles. The Hebrews and other primitive races adorned the ankles with bangles or anklets, not merely because of the additional comeliness imparted to the possessor of it by a good ankle, and not entirely because of the refreshment which the wearied traveller on the rough mountain path received from the musical clink of the anklet ornaments (*vide* 'Anklet'—Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible*), but also because of more substantial reasons. The ankle was admired as the seat of peculiar strength.

Luke, in his description of the healing of the lame man at the Beautiful Gate of the temple, says, 'His feet and *ankle bones* received strength,' and he adds that 'he, leaping up, stood and walked; and entered with them into the temple, walking, and leaping, and praising God.' Among primitive peoples, a good ankle is still prized as an indication of vigour.

A native of St. Kilda recently crossed to one of the Hebridean Islands, in Oriental fashion, to woo a lady who had been recommended to him by his

friends. He returned home, however, unaccompanied by a bride, and his simple but conclusive explanation was, 'She did not have the ankle.' The appreciation of a good ankle was more than a mere matter of æsthetic taste. The agility required for travelling over bogs, or through a rocky country, depended largely on a good ankle. The St. Kildan's expression is still employed as an equivalent for the lack of strength and endurance.

The strengthening of the ankles meant the imparting of strength and endurance. It was the experience of God's presence that gave both of these to the Psalmist. Men who appeared stronger and more fortunate in everything, except the enjoyment of the Divine presence, failed in the battle of life. Hittites and Hivites and other races, that knew not the Psalmist's God, have perished; but the Jewish race still manifests the characteristics of strength and endurance, and in the words of the ancient Commentator of Bobbio can say, 'Weariness comes not to my bones, though I travel firmly and for ever.'

The earlier Latin translators failed to see this point when they rendered the Hebrew words, 'Et (not sunt) infirmata vestigia mea.' Later translators gave the sense more accurately in the words, 'Neque vacillant malleoli pedum meorum.' Neither the King James' translators nor the more recent revisers ventured to give the words of the Psalm the peculiar significance recognized in them by the ninth-century commentator, although in both the

Authorised and Revised Versions the marginal reading is 'ankles.' GEORGE R. MACPHAIL.

Dundee.

The Faith of Jesus.

IN the interesting article of Principal Forsyth on the faith of Jesus (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, October 1909) we read: 'The New Testament writers seem almost deliberately to avoid applying to His relation to God the distinctive word which expresses ours both to God and Him.' May I call attention to He 12², where we are exhorted to look away unto 'Jesus, the captain and perfecter of faith.' The English version, to be sure, says *our* faith, but there is no authority for this, so far as I see, in the original. Jesus is described as the one who has brought faith to perfection—the *perfect example* of faith, we may paraphrase. This is in accordance with the context, for it is obvious that Jesus is the climax to whom the long list of Old Testament heroes leads up. As they through faith wrought righteousness and waxed valiant in fight, so He for the joy that was set before Him *endured the cross*, despising the shame—for endurance is more difficult than valiant action, and shame is harder to overcome than the most pugnacious foe. HENRY PRESERVED SMITH.

Meadville, Pa.

John ii. 19.

'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.'

OUR Lord, no doubt, was acquainted with the two passages of the O.T. cited by Mr. Weir; and Ezr 5¹² is interesting, as making it probable that the Aramaic word used was כתר, 'Tear down!' (see also 1 Es 1⁵⁵). But I would not venture to say that our Lord's words were only 'a reminiscence and combination' of those two passages (Is 26¹⁹, Ezr 5¹²). What about the 'three days,' which made the statement so utterly incredible to the Jews? One cannot help recalling Hosea's 'On the third day He will raise us up' (Hos 6²), and our Lord's own express reference to Jonah's 'three days and three nights in the whale's belly' (Mt 12⁴⁰).

Christ was speaking in the temple. It was therefore quite natural for His hearers to suppose

that, when He said 'Destroy this temple!', He meant the temple in which they were all present at the moment. Even His disciples do not appear to have grasped the full meaning of His words until after the Resurrection which fulfilled them (v. 22). 'The temple of (consisting of) his body' (v. 21) would naturally be the last thing they would think of.

Why was it that our Lord spoke thus of His body? Not because the Aramaic word for 'temple' (היכלא) also meant 'body.' There is no trace of such a meaning either in Aramaic or in Hebrew. Nor can the origin and primary sense of this word be sought in the Arabic, where it is, in fact, a loan from the Aramaic. The real ancestor of the Semitic *haykal*, *hêkal*, 'temple,' is the far older Sumerian or proto-Babylonian EGAL, 'palace,' 'temple.' EGAL is a compound of the two very common Sumerian words E, 'house,' and GAL, 'great,' and accordingly denotes 'great house'; which is obviously a suitable description of either a king's or a god's house, a palace or a temple. These two meanings of the Sumerian term EGAL are also the meanings of the Assyrian derivative *ekallu*, as well as of the related Aramaic and Hebrew terms. Now, in view of our Lord's peculiar claims as represented in this Gospel, there was nothing very surprising in His calling His body 'this temple.' For, on the one hand, the human body, regarded as the dwelling-place of the soul or spirit, is a 'house' (Job 4¹⁹, 'houses of clay'; 2 Co 5¹, 'our earthly tent-house'; cf. Jn 1¹⁴ ἐσκήνωσεν); and, on the other hand, a temple is a 'house of God' in ordinary Semitic speech (Gn 28^{17, 22}, Neh 6¹⁰; cf. the Assyrian *bît ilî*, 'house of a god,' 'temple'). And if St. Paul could ask his converts, 'Know ye not that your body is a temple' (ναός, strictly 'dwelling'; from ναίω, 'to dwell') 'of the Holy Ghost in you?' or 'Know ye not that ye are God's temple, and the Spirit of God houseth in you?' (1 Co 6¹⁹ 3¹⁶), with how much greater truth might His body be called a 'temple,' in Whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily (Col 2⁹).

But how is this saying of our Lord's relevant to the context? Clearly in this way. He has just expelled the dealers from His 'Father's House.' The Jews demand a 'sign' to justify this assumption of authority; and He answers them with an indirect intimation that He is Himself the Ultimate Authority. Standing there in the court of the

desecrated temple, He thinks of a higher, purer, truer Temple, His own immaculate Body, the shrine of Present Deity (chap. 14¹⁰). Compare His saying on another occasion: 'A greater thing than the temple is here!' (Mt 12⁶). And He, the Son of Man, does not say, 'Destroy this temple, and in three days *my Father* (or *God*; as, e.g., Ro 10⁹, 1 Co 6¹⁴) will raise it up.' He says: 'Destroy this temple, and in three days will I raise it up'; thus affirming by implication His own equality, or rather identity, with God (see chap. 5²¹ 14⁹). His actual words may have been סתרו היכלא הדין ובתלת יומין אקימניה (See for קום, the Targum at Is 26⁹ and Hos 6²).

C. J. BALL.

Oxford.

The Triumph-Joy.

I HAVE read with considerable interest the article by Rev. R. Martin Pope, M.A., on the above subject. That the word *θριαμβεύω* was, in its origin, intimately associated with the Greek drama no one will deny, and Paul's knowledge of profane literature is amply borne out by his apt quotations from Aratus (Ac 17²⁸), Menander (1 Co 15³³), and Epimenides (Tit 1¹²), his possible reference to the fable of Menenius Agrippa given by Livy (1 Co 12¹²⁻²⁷), and, on the authority of Sir W. M. Ramsay, his indebtedness to Athenodorus of Tarsus, whose writings had such an influence on Seneca also as to produce 'some very striking parallels' between the Apostle and the Stoic philosopher.

But it is noteworthy that the quotation from Aratus is from an astronomical poem, that from Epimenides from a treatise 'Concerning Oracles.' Livy and Athenodorus represent history and philosophy respectively, and the only *dramatist* is Menander. We have thus no authority for assuming that Paul was well acquainted with the Greek drama, and even if we had, is it not a fact that the original significance of *θριαμβεύω* had long been lost sight of in the Apostle's time, and had given way to the sense of 'triumph'? It is doubtless the element of 'joy' which unites the two significations—the song to Dionysus and the Roman triumph—but the context (and may we not add, contemporary usage?) so definitely marks out the latter meaning as to make the first part of Mr. Pope's article, if not irrelevant, at least of merely archæological interest.

I note also that, in dealing with the 'triumph,' he limits the application of the term to the conception of God 'leading his subjugated saints in triumph.' This brings the passage into line with Col 2¹⁵, has the authority of Lightfoot and Meyer, and is doubtless true to Pauline experience, for the Damascus journey has transformed the enemy of Christ into His willing captive, and the Apostle was never wearied of setting forth the contrast in order to magnify the grace of God. He was made a prisoner, not to be dragged to death, but to march to eternal life!

There is, however, another interpretation, numbering Calvin, Bengel, De Wette, and Stanley among its supporters, which would find the analogue of the Christian in the victorious soldiers participating in the triumph. This does not seem to have found wide acceptance, and Christian experience—an exegete of no mean value—in endorsing it combines the former with it; the Christian is a Christ-conquered man, now become a soldier of the King.

The translation 'leadeth us in triumph' would obviously suit both meanings, and it might also cover a further interpretation which sees in the passage a word-picture of the Victor bringing His people triumphantly back to liberty, after subjugating the enemy that had enslaved them. We are Christ's *potentially* by blood-bought rights, but until Mansoul by its own consent allows Prince Emmanuel to defeat Diabolus, we can neither possess true liberty, nor grace the Conqueror's triumph.

Might I suggest yet another possibility? Sometimes the hero of the Roman triumph was accompanied in his car by his dearest friends. This interpretation would almost necessitate the hiphil sense of *θριαμβεύω*—'causeth us to triumph'—and this is the sense given by Beza in his version ('Qui facit ut semper triumphemus in Christo'); it is also one of the meanings attached to the word by Liddell and Scott, and Thayer-Grimm, while recording the adverse opinion of Lightfoot and Meyer, yet applies it to 2 Co 2¹⁴. May not the Christian be regarded as the honoured friend of the great Victor, asked to accompany Him in the triumphal car, and share with Him the triumph-joy? It almost seems too daring! But the Conqueror Himself says to those who love Him, 'I have called you friends' (Jn 15¹⁵).

Each interpretation, from varying view-points, is

true to Christian teaching and experience. This at least is plain, that whether we are regarded as captives, soldiers, subjects, or friends, ours is the triumph-joy.

ARTHUR B. KINSEY.

Aberdare.

‘Stones of Rolling.’

IN the short notice of the newly issued ‘Century Bible’ volume, on *Ezra-Nehemiah-Esther* in your last issue, the writer says that when dealing with the same passages sometimes the ‘Cambridge Bible’ is more explicit and sometimes the ‘Century Bible.’ As an instance of the former, reference is made to what is said in both on Ezr 5⁸. In the ‘Century Bible’ the ‘Stones of rolling’ (EVV, ‘great stones’) are defined as ‘stones too large to be carried, and having therefore *to be rolled*.’ In the ‘Cambridge Bible’ the words are, ‘Stones too large for ordinary transport, and requiring to be *moved on rollers*.’ The writer says the meaning is the same. I wish to say that the meaning is not the same, and that if I had been *as explicit* as the author of the ‘Cambridge Bible,’ it would, in my opinion, have been at the expense of accuracy.

There is evidence that among the Assyrians the roller, the lever, and the pulley were used, though not much is said about the roller. For removing to considerable distances there is overwhelming evidence that the waggon, cart, and especially the sledge, were constantly employed. There is no proof that the Hebrews used rollers, though there is no contrary evidence of a decisive character. Were the great stones of Ezr 5⁸ and 6⁴ literally rolled along until they were brought into position? This seems to me, as it did to Keil, Rawlinson, and others, likelier than the supposition that they were ‘moved on rollers.’ I preferred, however, in my ‘Century Bible’ volume, retaining the ambiguity of the Hebrew text, as is done by the latest and best German commentators (Bertheau, Ryssel, Siegfried, Bertholet, etc.).

Yet it seemed to me, at the same time, quite likely that the Massoretic text is at fault, for in the very same note I go on to say that, perhaps, changing one consonant we should read *gōdēl* for *glāl* (written much the same as in unpunctuated Hebrew), and translate with the Peshitto Syriac and the English Versions ‘great stones.’ I am

now quite convinced that this textual change ought to be made. The looser renderings of the LXX, Lucian and of the Apocryphal 1 Esdras 6⁹ (see ‘Century Bible’), can be best explained from the text as thus amended.

In Dt 5²¹ (EVV 24) the Hebrew word *gōdēl* stands in connexion with ‘glory’ (both of God), and in other passages it seems to denote ‘splendour,’ ‘magnificence,’ as well as ‘greatness.’

T. WITTON DAVIES.

University College of North Wales.

The Camel and the Eye of the Needle.

WHEN Khizr Khan was married to the daughter of Alp Khan in 1312 A.D. there were rejoicings. ‘The juggler swallowed a sword like water, drinking it as a thirsty man would sherbet. He also thrust a knife up his nostril. He mounted little wooden horses and rode upon the air. Large bodies were made to issue out of small ones; an elephant was drawn through a window, and a camel through the eye of a needle.’ On this, in a note, the historian, Sir H. M. Elliot, comments: ‘This is the original, and shows that those who object to the common reading of the Bible have no good ground for any alteration. The phrase is universal in the East to express any difficulty.’¹

W. CROOKE.

Cheltenham.

‘The Marks of Jesus.’

I VENTURE a conjectural combination which may add something to Deissmann’s well-known discussion in *Bible Studies*. Can we trace the presence of these *στίγματα* elsewhere in the life of Paul?

What was it* that prompted Lysias to identify Paul with the Egyptian bandit chief (Ac 21³⁸)? The fury of the mob, mauling a man whom they would hate as having led some of their friends into a death-trap, might serve as a confirmation, but would hardly suggest the idea. It is clear that the rebel was at large; as certainly he was badly ‘wanted.’ We may safely assume that the Govern-

¹ See Sir H. M. Elliot, *The History of India as told by its own Historians*, iii. 553.

ment would circulate descriptions of such individuals, just as our own police do. The lines of such documents may be easily drawn from the *εἰκόνες* which abound among the papyri, identifying people signing official documents of all kinds. There is the subject's name, age, height, shape of face and nose, quality of hair, and especially the situation of identifying scars (*οὐλή μετώπῳ, δεξιῷ ἀντικνημίῳ*, etc.), which Egyptians of both sexes seem to have possessed to an abnormal extent: if such were absent, the description *ἄσημος* calls attention to the fact. If, moreover, he came from an outlying district, and was known to be deficient in Greek, he might perhaps be entered as *ἀγράμματος*, the word which in hundreds of papyri describes illiterates, who had to persuade some friend a little less unlettered to write for them.

With such an *εἰκὼν* stored in his memory, and assured of promotion if he is lucky enough to arrest its original, the Chiliarch eagerly scans his prize. Paul was so much exhausted with rough usage that he could not yet utter a word that might prove him *Ἑλληνιστὶ γινώσκειν* after all. And there was something in his face which identified him at once. The Egyptian Mahdi, who had attached his 400 *sicarii* to him by prowess in many a fight, would doubtless be well scarred. And Paul had been in the wars—wars in which his enemies' weapons at any rate had been decidedly carnal! One of them we specially recall here.

The fickle Galatians of Ac 14 had taken good care that he should not a second time be mistaken for Hermes. The murderous stone that stretched him senseless in the street at Lystra was presumably aimed at his head, and its *οὐλή* is likely in after years to have been conspicuous enough to tally with the scar that figured in the *εἰκὼν* of the brigand chief. Well might Paul remind the Galatians of honourable marks that ought to have secured him from ingratitude in Lystra of all places!

Nor were these scars only the talisman which Christ's servant bore to secure him from ill-treatment at the hands of those who recognized his Master. They were 'the marks of *Jesus*,' marks which told that the servant had only been treated like his Lord. The acute and highly probable argument of Johannes Weiss seems to justify our inferring that Paul had *seen* that Face 'so marred more than any man'—seen it in the judgment hall and on Calvary before it looked down on him from heaven. If so, Myers was right—as poets have a way of being—when he makes Paul say of the 'sorrows of the Son of Man':

Ah, with what bitter triumph had I seen them,
Drops of redemption bleeding from thy brow!
Thieves, and a culprit crucified between them,
All men forsaking him—and that was thou!

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

Didsbury.

Entre Nous.

The Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.

THE only way of reviewing the second volume here is by referring to other reviews. Quotations were made last month from such reviews as had then appeared. Many more have been issued now, and there is not one of them that has given a perfunctory notice of the volume. For fulness as well as appreciation the reviews of this volume have as yet surpassed those of the first volume.

THE GLASGOW HERALD.

More and more it becomes evident that this Encyclopædia—the first of its kind in any language—will make as well as mark an epoch in the history of the study of religion by providing in a

form at once comprehensive and concise, scientifically exact, and yet eminently readable, all the available data for that great synthesis upon the subject towards which we are moving. The Parliament of Religions was useful, if slightly melodramatic: the meetings of the Congress of Religions at Basle and Oxford have done much to inspire isolated students and to consolidate their scattered labours. But in Dr. Hastings' Encyclopædia, with its unexampled accumulation and assortment of the facts provided by an exact study of the world's religions, historic and prehistoric, savage and cultured, ethnic and Christian, the materials are being brought together out of which a real science of comparative religion and a satis-

factory because all-inclusive philosophy of religion itself will eventually be shaped.

THE OXFORD MAGAZINE.

The volume is written by specialists, and edited with the decisive judgment which we have learnt to expect from Dr. Hastings. It is not only a mine of information, but there is hardly an article which is not in itself worth reading for sheer interest.

THE LIVERPOOL POST.

In the second volume no better exemplification of the general scope and method of the *Encyclopædia* could be given than the article on 'The Abode of the Blest.' Here we have an article on the primitive and savage perceptions of the after-life, and subsequently, in detail, on the eschatology of Buddhism, of Ancient Egypt, Greece, Rome, Japan, and, in turn, of the Moslem, Persian, Semitic, Slavonic, Teutonic, and Celtic nations. This subject alone occupies no fewer than thirty closely printed pages of the *Encyclopædia*, nor are we able to say, after carefully perusing it, that it contains one unnecessary sentence or omits one necessary detail, and its interest is throughout enthralling.

THE UNITED METHODIST.

The preacher will probably find the article on 'Bible in the Church,' by Dr. E. von Dobschütz, to be the most immediately valuable of all the contents of this volume. In some respects it breaks new ground, for so comprehensive an outline of the influence of the Bible on the Christian Church and the life of the Christian people has not before appeared.

THE CHRISTIAN COMMONWEALTH.

The *Encyclopædia* is just what such a work should be, a mine of reliable learning, not an arsenal for argument or a field of dialectics. It is a monument of the intellectual enterprise and outstanding ability of its chief Editor, Dr. Hastings, who has no rival in this sort of difficult literary organization, which requires qualities akin to those which make a great military general. To survey the whole field, to arrange the operations, to get exactly the best man for each particular task, to synthesize the work of a multitude of minds, demands an order of genius. Under no other hands would such a prodigy of scholarship become

possible. The Editor and his collaborators must be congratulated on having achieved in a difficult region a conspicuous success. The student in any branch of inquiry covered in this ample programme may be conducted at once to the guide eminently fitted to give instruction, and to open out to him the authoritative sources of knowledge.

THE BRITISH CONGREGATIONALIST.

It is in regard to the greater themes of religion and ethics that the primary interest will be felt. These are in all cases thoroughly, and in most cases finely, treated. The articles dealing with individuals—such as those on Augustine and Bunyan—are ample both in biographical material and in their account of the thought of the men. The articles on Berkeley and Bacon by Professors Barker and J. L. M'Intyre are marvels of a condensation which does not impair completeness or lucidity. More distinctly 'spiritual' themes, such as 'Aspiration,' are not forgotten, and a mass of information on topics like 'Asceticism,' on religions such as Buddhism, and on psychological matters such as 'Attention,' 'Belief,' and 'Association,' is accumulated in such wise that no one will come to these pages seeking in vain.

THE OUTLOOK.

But the English reader will probably turn first to Dr. Sanday's article on 'The Bible,' which occupies some thirty-four columns. It is marked by all the Lady Margaret Professor's devout caution in accepting 'results' and by his occasional courage in suggesting solutions. For example, he sums up the case as to the Fourth Gospel pretty much in the terms of his last volume on that subject—neither for nor against the son of Zebedee. But when Budde, following Duhm, suggests that much of the Davidic history may be attributed to the 'archives of the house of Abiathar,' Dr. Sanday is quite willing to accept the exiled priest not in person but just 'as a symbol of the conditions under which this earliest and best of all the specimens of Hebrew historical writing was composed.' We trust that those who read this article will go on to that of Ernst von Dobschütz on 'The Bible in the Church,' for we do not know any work that puts all the facts within the same compass.

Professor Driver.

On the 19th of January, the Regius Professor of Hebrew was presented with his portrait in the Chapter House of Christ Church, Oxford.

The presentation was made by Dr. T. Herbert Warren, Vice-Chancellor of the University. Dr. Driver said :

Mr. Vice-Chancellor and Gentlemen,—I hardly know in what terms to reply to the very kind and generous words which you have just spoken. You have said far more than is my due, and I really feel unable adequately to acknowledge it, or to express my grateful appreciation of the spirit which has prompted it. I need scarcely say how very much surprised I was when I was told by a member of the Committee of the kind wish of my friends that there should be in Christ Church a permanent likeness of myself, and of their desire to honour me with the very signal mark of appreciation and regard which they have presented to me to-day. I am still more surprised to hear now of the many distinguished scholars, who have joined with those whom I have the pleasure of knowing personally in doing me this honour. I shall always retain a vivid and grateful recollection both of the kind thought on the part of my more immediate friends and also of the cordiality with which so many scholars, far and near, have combined for this purpose. The portrait is a speaking one, and most admirably finished ; a more skilful artist, or one who took greater pains and interest in his work, or, I may add, who made the sittings more agreeable to the sitter, it would, I am sure, have been impossible to find. I accept the portrait with the warmest gratitude and appreciation ; both I and my wife will prize it as our choicest and most valued possession ; and I shall place it in the lodgings of the Regius Professor of Hebrew in Christ Church as an heirloom for my successors. And I must, at the same time, express my thanks for the beautiful and interesting album containing the names of those who have contributed to the gift, which has been so thoughtfully compiled by the Committee. Will you bear with me for a few minutes while I say a few words about the course which the studies that I am interested in have taken during the last generation ?

THE STUDY OF HEBREW.

My lot has been cast in a time of transition ; and times of transition are proverbially difficult to

hold one's course in successfully. When I began Oriental studies, though there were excellent Hebrew scholars in England, they had not published much, and little help was obtained by students in this country from English writings. It had thus to be shown how the Hebrew language could be studied in the light of comparative philology and modern scientific method. Hebrew grammar and Hebrew lexicography had both to be presented to English students with a completeness comparable to that which had been attained by the best foreign scholars. It is humiliating to have to say foreign scholars ; but until recent years the spirit of research was only exceptionally displayed in this country ; the brilliant pioneering labours of Rawlinson and Hincks in Assyriology were among the exceptions. But Englishmen as a rule were too often satisfied with the knowledge they had : independent study and research, carried on with that thoroughness and scientific method which are characteristic of our Teutonic cousins, was practically unknown in this country. Scholarly methods appeal to scholarly minds ; and hence the influence which the scholarship in Germany—and that not only in Biblical subjects—when it became known in England, began quickly to exercise upon the best scholars among ourselves. And so this influence made itself felt in the study of Hebrew philology. There followed the question of text. It is true, editors of Hebrew and classical texts alike, have sometimes been rash and arbitrary in emendation : still, the fact remains that every scholar, not trammelled by dogmatic prepossessions, is at the present day convinced that the traditional Hebrew text of the Old Testament is in many places corrupt ; internal evidence often strongly suggests it ; the ancient versions preserve often transparently superior readings ; and the character of the Hebrew script lends itself far more readily to corruption than do the scripts of ancient Greece and Rome. The only question open is the extent of the corruption. Here many things have to be taken into account ; in the estimate formed of them, opinions naturally differ ; and no one can be sure that he has struck the golden mean. Regard to probability, and the exercise of self-criticism, and self-distrust, are, perhaps, the surest guides. But unquestionably the labours of recent years have placed within the reach of students a better text of the Old Testament than was available a generation ago.

HIGHER CRITICISM.

After textual, or lower criticism, follows higher, or, as it might better be called, documentary criticism—the criticism which seeks to determine the structure, date, and authorship of (in particular) ancient writings. Forty years ago the traditional view of the origin of the Old Testament writings was held practically by all English scholars; and the few who ventured to question it were told authoritatively to stand down. But experience had proved before that suppressive measures are powerless to suppress free inquiry; the truth made itself known, and has gradually become more and more generally recognized. From the nature of the case, the literary problems presented by the Bible cannot always be determined in a categorical manner; details may be of an ambiguous character, and so not conclusive; the problem itself may be too complicated to be solved with certainty; hence every point cannot be determined with equal exactness and equal certitude. On the other hand, where numerous details, or independent lines of argument, converge in the same direction, conclusions of great probability, or even of practical certainty, may be confidently formed. And so the general structure of the books composing the Old Testament, and the stages by which, as a whole, it gradually assumed its present form, have, in their broader features, been satisfactorily determined.

HISTORICAL CRITICISM.

With higher criticism historical criticism is closely associated: each in its turn is ancillary to the other: but as branches of study the two are, of course, distinct. It is a commonplace of historians that history must be built upon a criticism of sources. And the closer study of the Old Testament, which has been the outcome of recent years, has shown that the narratives contained in it must be used by the historian with discrimination: some are much more remote than others from the events which they describe, and are thus not of equal historical value. Since Ewald, between 1843 and 1859, published his epoch-making work, the distinction has been more and more recognized by all who have made any pretension to write the history of Israel from the standpoint of a modern historian. We cannot, while the history of every other people has been

placed on a more scientific basis than it occupied two generations ago, leave the history of Israel as it was. A presentation of it, making use of improved methods and taking account of distinctions formerly unrecognized, cannot be dispensed with. The same may be said of the history of Israel's religion. Here also the historical method has shown that growth is to be recognized more fully than was formerly the case. The Bible contains the record of a progressive revelation, and of an ever broadening and deepening apprehension of religious truth. An endeavour must be made to determine the stages through which the religion of Israel passed; and the relation in which the utterances of the prophets and poets of Israel stood to the age in which they individually lived, and to the circumstances of their time, must be recognized and exhibited. On both the political and the religious history of Israel great light has been thrown by the often astonishing archæological discoveries of the last half-century; the history and civilization of Babylonia, Assyria, and Egypt have been exhumed from the dust in which they were buried, and spread out before us in distinct and brilliant colours: the position which Israel took, by the side of these and other neighbours, has become much clearer to us than it once was; in particular, the influence of Babylonia upon it, while less indeed than has been maintained by some modern scholars, is known now to have been much greater than was once even suspected. The contemporary inscriptions of Israel's more immediate neighbours, the study of which was first placed upon a sound foundation by Gesenius in 1837, and the known number of which has since largely increased, afford many welcome illustrations of the ideas or language of the Old Testament.

NEW KNOWLEDGE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Excavation in Palestine has also taught us much; and the comparative study of religions has thrown valuable light on the origin and import of many of the customs and institutions of ancient Israel. A modern teacher of Old Testament subjects cannot confine himself to the Old Testament alone: he must be more or less familiar with such ever-widening subjects as I have just indicated. With whatever part of the Old Testament he is dealing, one or other of them may at any time illustrate it, or have a determining influence on

his conclusions respecting it. The knowledge and methods possessed by our forefathers are no more adequate now in philological and historical studies than they are in the study of natural science. We cannot either study, or understand, the Old Testament precisely as our ancestors did. It would be a dereliction of duty to withhold from the present generation of learners the light which by the providence of God has from different directions been thrown upon it. It has been my endeavour to take part with others in utilizing this new knowledge for the purpose of elucidating either the language or the contents of the Old Testament, as the case might be, and making it more intelligible, and, I hope, in consequence enabling it to be read with better comprehension and appreciation of its import than was possible a generation or two ago. I have also sought, in a time of transition, to distinguish between new views that were promulgated, to point out what ground was stable, what conclusions followed with reasonable probability from the data at our disposal, and what were more or less hypothetical constructions, which might or might not be confirmed in the future. And I take it as indicating on the part of those who have combined to offer me to-day this most gratifying token of regard, their sense that I have not altogether failed in the efforts I have made to contribute something towards that re-vivification of Biblical study, and re-discovery of the historical significance of the Bible, for which so much has been accomplished in the present generation. It has already often been to me a genuine help and encouragement to find how many men of knowledge and ability and judgment—some my own personal pupils, and others approaching the subject independently—have followed substantially the same lines that I have taken myself; and I cannot say how materially these feelings have been strengthened by the far-reaching sympathy and approval which has been so warmly and eloquently attested by the noble present which has been given to me to-day. I thank you, Mr. Vice-Chancellor, for your kindness in presiding on this occasion, upon a day which I shall never forget, and for the words of too generous appreciation which you have spoken; I thank the Committee and the secretaries for what, I am sure, the latter especially must have found often a toilsome work; and I thank from the bottom of

my heart the friends, absent as well as present, who have combined to present me with this most touching expression of their appreciation and esteem.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. E. J. Roberts, B.D., Baptist Church, Melbourne, Derbyshire, to whom a copy of Dykes's *Divine Worker in Creation and Providence* will be sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for April must be received by the 1st of March. The text is Rev 21⁵.

The Great Text for May is Rev 21²⁷—'And there shall in no wise enter into it anything unclean, or he that maketh an abomination and a lie: but only they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.' A copy of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or of Scott's *Pauline Epistles*, or of Wilson's *How God has Spoken*, or of Dykes's *Divine Worker in Creation and Providence*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for June is Rev 22^{3, 4}—'And there shall be no curse any more: and the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be therein: and his servants shall do him service; and they shall see his face; and his name shall be on their foreheads.' A copy of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, or Downer's *Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit*, or Leckie's *Authority in Religion*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for July is Rev 22¹⁴—'Blessed are they that wash their robes, that they may have the right to come to the tree of life, and may enter in by the gates into the city.' A copy of Walker's *The Spirit and the Incarnation*, or Downer's *Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit*, or Oswald Dykes's *Christian Minister and his Duties*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for August is Rev 22¹⁷—'And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And he that heareth, let him say, Come. And he that is athirst, let him come: he that will, let him take the water of life freely.' A copy of Gordon's *Early Traditions of Genesis*, or of Scott's *Pauline Epistles*, or of Walker's *Gospel of Reconciliation*, will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.